PB84-103829

Analysis of Carbon Monoxide Emissions as a Function of Ambient Temperature and Vehicle Parameters

(U.S.) Environmental Protection Agency
Ann Arbor, MI

Jul 83

U.S. Department of Commerce
National Technical Information Service
NTIS

TECHNICAL REPORT DATA
(Please read Instructions on the reverse before completing)

1. REPORT NO.	2.	3. RECIPIENT'S ACCESSION NO.
EPA/AA/CTAB/TA/83-6		PB84 103829

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE
An Analysis of Carbon Monoxide Emissions As A Function of Ambient Temperature and Vehicle Parameters.

5. REPORT DATE
July 1983

6. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION CODE

7. AUTHOR(S)
Larry C. Landman

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NO.

9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Mobile Sources
Control Technology Assessment & Characterization Branch
Ann Arbor, MI 48105

10. PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.

11. CONTRACT/GRANT NO.

12. SPONSORING AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS
Same as box 9.

13. TYPE OF REPORT AND PERIOD COVERED
Technical

14. SPONSORING AGENCY CODE

15. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

16. ABSTRACT

This report is an analysis of existing data on 16 vehicles in EPA's Controlled Environmental Test Facility. The analyses indicate that cold weather carbon monoxide (CO) emissions appear to depend most on fuel metering type, with the carbon monoxide emissions of the carbureted vehicles being more sensitive to temperature changes than those of the fuel injected vehicles. Also, it is easier to predict the differences in carbon monoxide emissions ("cold" minus "hot") versus temperature than it is to predict the ratio ("cold" divided by "hot"). Since the sample was small and not representative of all emission control systems, the results might not apply to all vehicles.

17. KEY WORDS AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

a. DESCRIPTORS	b. IDENTIFIERS/OPEN ENDED TERMS	c. COSATI Field/Group
Air Pollution Carbon Monoxide Exhaust Emissions Fuel Systems Motor Vehicles Temperature	Emission Control Systems Cold-Start Tests Vehicle Parameters	

18. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT	19. SECURITY CLASS *(This Report)*	21. NO. OF PAGES
release unlimited	unclassified	63
	20. SECURITY CLASS *(This page)* unclassified	22. PRICE

EPA Form 2220-1 (9-73)

PB84-103829

EPA/AA/CTAB/TA/83-6

Technical Report

An Analysis of Carbon Monoxide Emissions As a Function of Ambient Temperature and Vehicle Parameters

by

Larry C. Landman

July, 1983

NOTICE

Technical Reports do not necessarily represent final EPA decisions or positions. They are intended to present technical analysis of issues using data which are currently available. The purpose of the release of such reports is to facilitate the exchange of technical information and to inform the public of technical developments which may form the basis for a final EPA decision, position or regulatory action.

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Air, Noise and Radiation
Office of Mobile Sources
Emission Control Technology Division
Control Technology Assessment and Characterization Branch
2565 Plymouth Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA 22161

Introduction

Numerous investigators have reported the observations that:

1) Carbon monoxide (CO) exhaust emissions tend to increase as ambient temperature decreases.

2) The "cold-start emissions" (those emitted prior to light-off of the catalyst) are the most sensitive to a drop in the ambient temperature [1,5,6,7]*.

This tendency toward increased CO emissions is suspected as being a major factor causing National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) violations for CO during cold weather conditions [1].

To investigate possible functional relationships between cold weather CO emissions and emission control technology or vehicle parameters, we reviewed existing data on eighteen (18) vehicles for which cold-start tests were performed in EPA's Controlled Environmental Test Facility (CETF). These data were generated between February 1980 and October 1981. Since these vehicles were not specifically chosen as a representative sampling of the population of late-model year vehicles, care must be taken in generalizing the results of these analyses.

Results of these analyses may be used in the development of future test programs designed to investigate ways to reduce cold weather CO emissions.

---

*Bracketed, [ ], numbers indicate references at the end of this report.

Conclusions and Recommendations

In the limited data base which was used, we conclude that the most significant vehicle parameter related to CO emissions at low ambient temperature is the type of fuel metering system. The vehicles equipped with electronic fuel injection (EFI) exhibited greater cold weather CO control than did the carbureted vehicles. Of secondary importance is the vehicle's test weight (ETW) and the type of secondary air injection used.

We had limited success in predicting both cold-start CO emissions and the increase in cold-start CO emissions (in grams per mile) relative to FTP ambient temperatures (75°F) as functions of ambient temperature, type of fuel metering system, and ETW. However, the percent of CO increase (relative to 75°F) correlated poorly with the available variables. From this, we infer that an additive rather that multiplicative "correction factor" for cold weather CO emissions may be a more appropriate form.

We did find a high positive correlation, at low ambient temperatures, between the increase in fuel consumed (Bag 1 fuel consumption minus Bag 3 fuel consumption) and the corresponding increase in CO emissions. This is further indication that the cold-start fuel enrichment systems are responsible for much of the low ambient temperature CO emissions.

It is difficult to determine, from the data set used for this report, how important each design parameter is, since the data set does not include every possible combination of all the parameters. It is obvious, however, that the important parameters to concentrate on in future investigations are those related to the fuel metering, air injection, and cold-start fuel enrichment systems. In an ideal sense, further cold room testing would involve test vehicles that had the following characteristics:

(1) Vehicles representing all combinations of fuel metering systems (e.g., 1, 2, and 4 barrel carburetion; throttle-bodied fuel injection (TBI); multi-point fuel injection) and secondary air systems (e.g., no air injection, pulse air injection, air pump) used in late-model vehicles and/or likely to be used in future vehicles, and

(2) Venicles representing various types of cold-start fuel enrichment systems. (We could then search for readily identifiable vehicle parameters which correlate with the cold start effects of these systems, and quantify the effects on cold weather CO emissions.)

Test Vehicles & Test Results

The 18 test venicles are described in Table 1. As indicated in that table, data from the first ten (10) vehicles were used in reference 1, the next five (5) appeared in reference 2, and the last vehicle appeared in reference 3. Data generated by vehicle D160 (1981 Chrysler K-Car Wagon) and vehicle 1009 (Ethyl's lean-burn concept car) have not appeared in any previous EPA technical report.

It should be noted that both the Ethyl lean-burn car (a 1978 Ford Fairmont with a modified Peugeot V-6 engine and an Asian-Warner A4(OD) transmission) and the Dresser Nova (a modified 1977 Chevrolet Nova equipped with a Dresser sonic carburetor) are prototype vehicles which embody hardware that is not used on production cars. Thus, some of the regression analyses were done both with and without these two vehicles. Additionally, vehicle FB289 (the turbocharged Datsun 280ZX) was an experimental prototype and, thus, not necessarily representative of either the 1981 or 1982 model year Nissan venicles.

Table 1

Test Vehicle Descriptions

	MFR	VID	YEAR/ STANDARD		MODEL	CID(ℓ) / No. of Cyl
1	Ford	9S1-5.8M-H-400	1979	CA	T-BIRD	351(5.8)/8
2	Nissan	FB223	1980	49	280ZX	168(2.8)/6
3	Nissan	FB178	1980	CA	280ZX	168(2.8)/6
4	GM	P0948	1981	49	GRAND PRIX	265(4.3)/8
5	GM	03H2-94472C	1980	CA	CUTLASS SUPREME	260(4.3)/8
6	Ford	8R10Y131366	1978	CA	PINTO	140(2.3)/4
7	GM	4M47AAH202725	1980	50	REGAL	231(3.8)/6
8	Nissan	FB289	N/A		280ZX TURBO	168(2.8)/6
9	Plymouth	D162	1981	49	RELIANT	135(2.2)/4
10	Toyota	MA46100183	1980	50	CELICA SUPRA	156(2.6)/6
11	Chry	B3BK26B4BC184143	1981		K-CAR	135(2.2)/4
12	Ford	1FABP082XBW20356	1981		ESCORT WAGON	98(1.6)/4
13	Ford	1FABP21B3BK15310	1981		FAIRMONT	200(3.3)/6
14	GM	1G1AX68X7B621755	1981		CITATION	173(2.8)/6
15	GM	2G1AW69J6B144479	1981		MALIBU	267(4.4)/8
16	Chry	D160	1981		K-CAR (WGN)	135(2.2)/4
17	Ethyl	1009	N/A		ETHYL LEAN-BURN	163(2.6)/6
18	Dresser	1X69L7L104103	N/A		DRESSER '77 NOVA	350(5.7)/8

Table 1 (Continued)

Test Vehicle Descriptions

	ETW (lb)	TRAN	EMISSION CONTROL SYSTEM EGR	AIR	CATALYST ‡	A/F	FUEL METR.	REF
1	4500	A3	YES	PUMP	OXD(M)	OPEN	2 bbl	[1]
2	3250	A3	YES	PULSE	OXD(M)	OPEN	EFI	[1]
3	3125	M5	NO	NO AIR	3WY(M)	CLOSED	EFI	[1]
4	3875	L3	YES	PUMP	3WY(P)+OXD(P)	CLOSED	2 bbl	[1]
5	3500	A3	YES	PUMP	3WY(P)	CLOSED	2 bbl	[1]
6	2750	A3	YES	PUMP	3WY(M)+OXD(M)	CLOSED	2 bbl	[1]
7	3750	A3	NO	PUMP	3WY(P)	CLOSED	2 bbl	[1]
8	3250	A3	YES	NO AIR	3WY(M)	CLOSED	EFI	[1]
9	2750	M4	YES	PUMP	3WY(M)+OXD(M)	CLOSED	2 bbl	[1]
10	3000	A4-OD	YES	NO AIR	3WY(M)+3WY(P)	CLOSED	EFI	[1]
11	2750	A3	YES	PUMP	3WY(M)+OXD(M)	CLOSED	2 bbl	[2]
12	2500	M4	YES	PUMP	3WY(M)+OXD(M)	OPEN	2 bbl	[2]
13	3375	A3	YES	PUMP	3WY(M)+ [illegible]D(M)	OPEN	1 bbl	[2]
14	3000	A3	YES	PULSE	3WY(M)+OXD(M)	CLOSED	2 bbl	[2]
15	3625	A3	YES	PUMP	3WY(P)+OXD(P)	CLOSED	2 bbl	[2]
16	2625	M4	YES	PUMP	3WY(M)+OXD(M)	CLOSED	2 bbl	None
17	2750	A4-OD	YES	PUMP	NONE	OPEN	3 bbl	[4]
18	4000	A3	YES	NO AIR	3WY(P)	OPEN	SONIC	[3]

‡ 'P' designates a Pelleted catalytic converter, and 'M' designates a Monolith.

The CO exhaust emissions from those test vehicles, over the FTP driving cycle, appear in Appendix 1. The emissions, in grams per mile, are given for the cold start (Bag 1), hot transient (Bag 2), and the hot start (Bag 3) portions of the FTP cycle. Those data are presented graphically, for each vehicle, in Appendix 2.

Data Analyses

As tne 18 graphs in Appendix 2 illustrate, the CO emissions during the hot transient (Bag 2) and hot start (Bag 3) portions of the FTP are relatively low and relatively insensitive to the ambient temperature. The only possible exception to this observation could be the performance of three of the four Ford vehicles (see Figures 07, 12, and 13 of Appendix 2). These three vehicles exhibit a trend in low temperature Bag 2 and Bag 3 CO emissions that appear somewhat different from the other vehicles. For the purposes of this report, no special analysis based on this observation was made. However, it may be necessary and appropriate to consider the low temperature Bag 2 and Bag 3 results of vehicles in future test programs, based on this observation.

For this report, the analysis was divided into the following five areas:

1) Analysis of the cold start (Bag 1) CO emissions only. This results in analysis of Bag 1 emissions in grams per mile.

2) Analysis of the amount by which the Bag 1 CO emissions exceeded the Bag 3 CO emissions (i.e., the difference of Bag 1 and Bag 3 emissions). This results in analysis of grams per mile differences.

3) Analysis of the amount by which the Bag 1 CO emissions exceeded the average Bag 1 CO emissions at 75°F for each vehicle. This results in analysis of grams per mile differences.

4) Analysis of the ratio of the Bag 1 CO emissions to the average Bag 1 CO emissions at 75°F. This results in analysis of dimensionless quantities equivalent to percent increases in CO emissions.

5) Analysis of the ratio of the Bag 1 CO emissions to the corresponding Bag 3 emissions. This results in analysis of dimensionless quantities equivalent to percent increase in CO emissions.

For each vehicle, equations were generated to approximate CO emissions by using a "best fit" first-degree and a "best fit" second-degree polynominal in ambient temperature (Appendix 3). The best fit was obtained using the least-squares-fit method, which smoothed the data, and provided an insight into the shape of the CO emissions versus ambient temperature curve. A second set of equations was generated by using results from tests for which the ambient temperature was below 90°F. Selection of a quadratic equation in ambient temperature to model CO emissions was based on a visual observation of the data. That is, the quadratic is the simplest function that is concave upwards and decreases as temperature increases. In addition, modeling the CO emissions with such a function has been used in the past.[5] For <u>each</u> of the 64 least-squares-fit equations for Bag 1 CO in Appendix 3, we calculated:

1) predicted CO emissions at 20°, 40°, and 75°F,

2) predicted slope of the equation at 20°, 40°, and 75°F,

3) predicted sensitivity of the equation at 20°, 40°, and 75°F, where sensitivity is the per cent change in CO emissions divided by the per cent change in temperature,

4) ratio of the predicted CO emissions at 20°F to those at 75°F.

For each of the four combinations of temperature interval and polynominal degree, we computed correlation coefficients between each of those calculated values and the following eleven (11) vehicle parameters:

1) secondary air (air pump, pulse air, or no air)

2) number of catalysts (0, 1, or 2)

3) equipped with an oxidation catalyst only (yes or no)

4) equipped with a three-way catalyst only (yes or no)

5) equipped with both a three-way and oxidation catalyst (yes or no)

6) type of catalyst (pelletted or monolith)

7) fuel metering system (fuel injected or carbureted)

8) control of air/fuel ratio (open or closed loop)

9) equipped with EGR (yes or no)

APPENDIX 2

Plots of CO Emissions for Each Test Vehicle

(Bag-by-Bag)

(Note: All CO scales are <u>not</u> the same.)

10) equivalent test weight (ETW) (in pounds)

11) number of cylinders (4, 6, or 8)

Conspicuous by its absence from the preceding list is a vehicle design parameter directly relating to cold-start fuel enrichment (e.g., choke angle as functions of time and temperature). Thus, this important factor was omitted from the list because no variable was found to consistently represent it for each of the test vehicles. However, some of the characteristics of cold-start fuel enrichment may be inferred from the amount of additional fuel consumed to perform the cold-start relative to the corresponding hot-start (i.e., Bag 1 minus Bag 3 fuel consumption). This difference in total fuel consumed (in grams) appears in Appendix 1.

The matrices of the calculated correlation coefficients appear in Appendix 4. Each correlation coefficient, r, between pairs of variables is the standard product-moment correlation coefficient.* This value is used to describe the strength of the linear relationship (if any) between the two variables being correlated. The tables in Appendix 4 give the correlation coefficients between pairs of actual data (from Appendix 1) and vehicle parameters, between pairs of model predicted data (from Appendix 3) and vehicle parameters, and between pairs of vehicle parameters. The selection of model predicted values was made to allow us to correlate the shape of the CO emission curves (i.e., slope and sensitivity) with the various vehicle parameters.

*For example, see Introduction to the Theory of Statistics by Yale, G.U., and Kendall; M.G. Hafner Publishing Company, New York 1968, p. 216.

Choice of numerical values on which to base a judgment about whether or not there is a relationship of the type being investigated is always a matter of choice. For this analysis we judged the variables to be linearly related, if we can accept that null hypothesis of linear dependence at the 0.01 significance level. The only vehicle parameters thus defined which correlated highly (either positively or negatively) with the low temperature CO values (either actual or calculated) were those related to the fuel metering system, secondary air system, ETW, and possession of only a three-way catalyst. Unexpectedly, the ratio of the CO emissions at 20°F to CO emissions at 75°F (or equivalently, the percent of increase in the CO emissions at lower temperatures) did not correlate highly with any of those eleven vehicle parameters. Possession of only a three-way catalyst was dropped as a significant variable because of its high correlation with secondary air systems.

The increase in Bag 1 relative to Bag 3 CO emissions (i.e., Bag 1 minus Bag 3 emissions) correlated highly with the corresponding increase in fuel consumption at ambient temperatures below the FTP temperature range (68°F to 86°F). (Appendix 4) It, therefore, appears likely that the temperature-related increases in CO emissions are due to the cold-start fuel enrichment system.

We then used both stepwise forward and stepwise backward regression analyses to model the actual cold-start CO emissions as a function of the three (3) continous variables: TEMP (ambient temperature), TEMP.2 (square of the ambient temperature), and ETW. The TEMP variables were chosen because of the success in modeling individual car CO results (see Appendix 3). ETW was chosen because, in the correlation matrices in Appendix 4, ETW was almost always the next most highly correlated variable in the linear sense after the three following

categorical variables which were previously determined to be (linearly) related to cold weather CO at the 0.01 level of significance:

PMP (0 = No air pump, 1 = Has air pump)
PLS (0 = No pulse air, 1 = Has pulse air)
FS (0 = EFI, 1 = Carbureted)

It is important to note that, in this sample of 16 cars, those six variables are <u>not</u> independent. The variables PMP and PLS are, of course, always mutually exclusive (i.e., no car is equipped with both an air pump system and a pulse air injection system). However, in this study, the type of secondary air injection system (PMP or PLS) correlates highly with the type of fuel metering system (FS): all the test vehicles with air pumps were carbureted, while all the vehicles without secondary air were fuel injected. Thus, for this sample of 16 cars, the combinations of the categorical variables produce only four, rather than six, subsets with data in them.

Stepwise forward regression analyses were performed using those variables, products of those variables with the categorical variables, and with products of the categorical variables. Stepwise backward regression analyses had to be performed with a reduced set of variables because the matrix of coefficients used by the MIDAS statistical program became singular when all the variable and product terms were used.

The end results of those regression analyses are given in Appendix 5. Those results indicate that the CO emissions can be modeled using those variables, and those models yield multiple-Rs of about 88 percent for the vehicles in <u>this</u> sample. In light of the high degree of correlation among what should be independent variables, the final regression equations

are not vital. What is important, however, is the fact that the most critical variable (after "temperature") in modeling cold-start CO emissions is the fuel metering system (FS) and possibly air systems. This observation is illustrated in Figures 1 to 3.

Equally important is the fact that attempts to model the ratio of increase in CO emissions from 75°F resulted in multiple Rs of 0.66 to 0.68. Thus, the proportion of the variability (the square of R) in that ratio of CO emissions that is explained by temperature, ETW, and the categorical variables is less than 46 percent. This seems to indicate that use of a multiplicative form of "correction factor" to calculate cold weather CO may not be as good as an additive form.

If we use tne results of the regression analyses in Appendix 5, not to predict CO emissions, but rather to predict the difference in CO emissions between the carbureted and fuel injected vehicles at low ambient temperatures (i.e., 20°F), the equations predict:

1) Cold-start CO emissions of the carbureted vehicles exceed those of the fuel injected vehicles by 72 grams per mile. (The actual data indicate 79.6 grams per mile.)

2) The increase in cold-start CO emissions from 75°F to 20°F for the carbureted vehicles exceeded by 65 grams per mile the corresponding increase for the fuel injected vehicles. (The actual data indicate 74.2 grams per mile.)

These predictions are borne out by Figures 1 and 2.

Figure 1

Average Bag 1 CO Emissions Versus Ambient Temperature
(Means of Actual Data from Appendix 1)
Stratified by Fuel Metering & Secondary Air Systems



Figure 2

Average Difference between Bag 1 CO Emissions and Bag 1 CO Emissions at 75°F Ambient Temperature
(Means of Actual Data from Appendix 1)
Versus Ambient Temperature
Stratified by Fuel Metering & Secondary Air Systems



Figure 3

Average Difference between Bag 1 CO Emissions and Bag 3 CO Emissions Versus Ambient Temperature
(Means of Actual Data from Appendix 1)
Stratified by Fuel Metering & Secondary Air Systems



References

1. Robert I. Bruetsch, "Carbon Monoxide and Non-FTP Ambient Temperature," EPA Technical Report Number EPA/AA/CTAB/ TA/ 81-7, February 1981.

2. Rodney J. Branham, "Evaluation of the Temperature Effects on Five 1981 Passenger Vehicles," EPA Technical Report Number EPA-AA-TEB-82-4, December 1981.

3. Thomas J. Penninga, "Evaluation of a Dresserator System Test Venicle," EPA Technical Report Number EPA-AA-TEB81-21, June 1981.

4. F.J. Marsee, "Ethyl Concept Car vs. 1980 Production Car," Ethyl Corporation Research Laboratories, Report Number ERM 80-4, May 1980.

5. N. Ostrouchov, "Effect of Cold Weather on Motor Vehicle Emissions and Fuel Economy," SAE Paper Number 780084, February-March 1978.

6. R.S. Spindt and F.P. Hutchins, "The Effect of Ambient Temperature Variation on Emissions and Fuel Economy - An Interim Report," SAE Paper Number 790228, February-March 1979.

7. J.N. Braddock, "Impact of Low Ambient Temperature on 3-Way Catalyst Car Emissions," SAE Paper Number 810280, February 1981.

APPENDIX 1

CO Emission Data from FTP Driving Cycle

Appendix 1

CO Emissions Data from FTP Driving Cycle

Vehicle I.D.	Temp (°F)	Test Number	--- CO Emissions (g/mi) --- Bag 1	Bag 2	Bag 3	ΔFuel Used*
9S1-5.8M-H-400	20.0	801423	201.919	4.318	9.989	313.1
1979 Ford T-Bird	60.0	801424	105.835	0.601	9.409	227.5
	60.0	801427	106.355	2.201	7.220	194.6
	74.0	801454	46.897	0.632	7.761	158.4
	75.0	801632	47.816	0.921	9.352	151.3
	75.0	801648	53.442	0.709	5.725	170.4
	100.0	801579	13.369	3.259	20.331	84.7
	101.0	801580	10.528	3.127	13.388	59.0
FB223	21.0	802513	22.348	0.0	0.072	202.6
1980 49-State	22.0	802514	19.172	0.0	0.537	173.4
Datsun 280ZX	60.0	801642	7.280	-0.007	0.567	114.5
	60.0	801644	7.173	0.019	0.019	126.6
	74.0	801641	6.219	0.019	1.569	34.9
	75.0	801640	9.375	0.014	0.513	90.8
	75.0	802414	6.253	0.012	1.283	203.5
	75.0	802578	8.661	0.005	0.969	41.2
	99.0	801639	9.571	0.025	1.444	55.6
	100.0	801643	8.088	0.029	1.270	60.7
	100.0	802413	11.101	0.0	2.360	50.4
FB178	20.0	802687	30.701	1.239	1.520	173.5
1980 California	20.0	802810	27.514	1.342	1.434	164.0
Datsun 280ZX	60.0	802586	10.797	0.960	0.966	97.1
	60.0	802589	10.375	1.042	0.901	97.6
	75.0	802434	11.102	1.044	0.871	87.4
	75.0	802435	7.010	1.143	0.852	77.6
	75.0	802681	13.953	1.250	1.342	97.8
	75.0	802684	7.666	0.737	1.201	75.2
P0948	20.0	803474	141.126	0.221	0.812	441.6
1981 Grand Prix	20.0	803476	159.249	0.096	1.189	456.8
	60.0	803098	77.532	0.116	0.678	272.4
	60.0	803101	69.041	0.106	1.030	246.5
	75.0	803092	9.597	0.321	2.803	132.0
	75.0	803095	10.308	0.184	3.060	130.0
	100.0	803404	5.162	0.096	1.784	92.0
	101.0	803479	3.604	0.062	0.709	89.3
03H2-94472C	20.0	803783	98.346	0.702	0.648	265.2
1980 Cutlass Sup	20.0	803786	107.345	0.400	0.655	271.3
	60.0	803597	39.290	0.326	0.622	139.5
	62.0	803590	38.939	0.323	0.892	126.9
	74.8	803777	10.487	0.229	0.590	96.6
	75.0	803593	12.910	0.284	0.658	96.5
	75.0	803776	14.462	0.314	0.849	90.9
	100.0	803779	7.305	0.649	2.411	27.0
	100.0	803781	6.653	0.275	1.266	36.3

* ΔFuel Used is the amount of fuel (in grams) consumed during Bag 1 minus the amount consumed during Bag 3. (Fuel consumption was calculated using carbon balance equations.)

Appendix 1 (Continued)

CO Emissions Data from FTP Driving Cycle

Vehicle I.D.	Temp (°F)	Test Number	--- CO Emissions (g/mi) --- Bag 1	Bag 2	Bag 3	ΔFuel Used
8R10Y131366	20.0	803933	97.613	5.910	17.919	184.8
1978 Ford Pinto	20.0	803936	88.559	5.554	23.145	154.8
	60.0	803674	27.947	0.066	0.611	116.3
	60.0	803676	27.297	0.329	0.460	81.9
	75.0	803663	22.836	0.178	1.077	91.6
	75.0	803665	17.875	0.122	1.127	76.3
	100.0	803668	2.238	1.098	3.157	27.3
	100.0	803671	6.124	1.600	3.413	14.0
4M47AAH202725	20.0	804131	64.178	4.942	5.065	312.5
1980 Buick Regal	20.0	804134	56.155	5.601	4.898	282.6
	60.0	804120	17.679	5.000	5.320	110.7
	60.0	804121	21.757	6.136	5.458	142.7
	75.0	804114	19.690	4.978	6.991	106.1
	100.0	804124	10.289	8.589	9.873	46.1
	100.0	804126	8.762	7.101	9.148	42.3
FB289	20.0	805435	12.440	0.567	0.532	188.5
1981.5 Datsun	20.0	805438	20.557	0.548	0.501	221.6
280ZX Turbo	20.0	805441	10.744	0.633	1.467	190.2
	20.0	806124	14.897	0.564	1.319	205.8
	60.0	805432	4.366	0.487	0.488	106.6
	60.0	805451	4.661	0.537	0.538	105.9
	60.0	805821	5.282	0.614	0.533	106.7
	60.0	806114	7.690	0.681	1.853	106.3
	75.0	805377	3.458	0.528	0.529	82.0
	75.0	805380	2.853	0.667	0.566	86.3
	100.0	805372	3.891	0.625	0.697	61.7
	100.0	805375	5.369	0.527	0.838	57.9
D162	20.0	806250	54.110	0.599	2.258	214.7
1981 Ply Reliant	20.0	806253	48.207	0.373	2.886	191.3
	60.0	806241	14.062	0.631	2.472	74.0
	60.0	806244	15.979	0.652	2.447	86.0
	75.0	806232	7.408	0.619	2.496	52.6
	75.0	806235	9.771	0.656	2.909	55.8
	100.0	806239	6.313	0.658	2.525	34.1
	100.0	806247	7.217	1.594	2.247	41.7
	100.0	806402	6.838	0.789	0.862	23.3

Appendix 1 (Continued)

CO Emissions Data from FTP Driving Cycle

Vehicle I.D.	Temp (°F)	Test Number	--- CO Emissions (g/mi) --- Bag 1	Bag 2	Bag 3	ΔFuel Used
MA46100183	20.0	806710	36.404	0.486	0.455	236.6
1980 Celica Supra	20.0	806713	36.169	0.469	0.644	241.7
	60.0	806704	10.590	0.436	0.281	123.5
	60.0	806707	13.954	0.490	0.290	122.7
	71.5	805387 ‡	70.073	61.705	55.500	109.7
	72.5	805537	6.873	0.217	0.167	98.1
	73.0	806359	6.685	0.113	0.129	87.2
	74.5	805383	5.234	0.207	0.203	115.2
	74.5	806357	6.490	0.324	0.229	98.6
	75.0	805385	6.887	0.292	0.332	107.4
	75.0	806361	5.440	0.417	0.573	68.5
	75.0	806698	10.784	0.678	0.494	95.9
	75.0	806701	5.987	0.416	0.235	98.9
	100.0	806690	3.137	0.339	0.455	50.0
	100.0	806693	3.163	0.394	0.340	49.0
B3BK26B4BC184143	22.0	810713	125.399	0.383	6.093	256.1
1981 Chry K-Car	59.0	810711	23.944	0.363	5.055	64.2
	72.5	810697	22.938	0.369	2.545	79.2
	97.0	810734	12.355	0.961	2.552	48.2
1FABP082XBW20356	23.0	810849	78.402	1.093	16.846	135.6
1981 Escort Wagon	58.5	810826	14.142	0.645	4.084	88.0
	75.0	810822	11.206	1.256	5.376	62.8
	98.0	810824	10.620	2.117	7.376	44.6
1FABP21B3BK15310	22.2	810575	136.083	78.495	5.434	208.8
1981 Fairmont	59.0	810573	3.578	0.012	0.453	134.3
	74.0	810569	3.980	0.029	1.362	89.7
	100.0	810571	3.853	0.069	1.943	81.9
1G1AX68X7B621755	22.0	810752	58.147	0.091	3.144	219.1
1981 Citation	60.5	810750	23.018	0.176	2.750	92.0
	75.0	810746	17.174	0.059	3.965	76.6
	101.5	810748	11.036	0.156	3.564	62.0
2G1AW69J6B144479	18.7	811194	133.036	0.182	1.900	421.8
1981 Chev Malibu	60.0	811188	8.836	0.049	2.908	139.5
	73.6	811180	9.080	0.059	1.780	107.2
D160	20.0	807526	97.453	0.722	2.459	317.9
1981 Chry K-Wagon	60.0	807528	21.637	0.329	2.699	106.8
	75.0	807389	12.710	0.392	2.780	85.8
	75.0	807392	13.355	0.584	2.469	84.2
	100.0	807381	7.043	0.460	2.277	53.2
	100.0	807386	6.646	0.876	2.153	53.8

‡ Designates a questionable test result which was omitted from the analyses. (A result was deleted if it differed from the corresponding mean for that vehicle at that temperature by more than two standard deviations.)

Appendix 1 (Continued)

CO Emissions Data from FTP Driving Cycle

Vehicle I.D.	Temp (°F)	Test Number	--- CO Emissions (g/mi) --- Bag 1	Bag 2	Bag 3	ΔFuel Used
1009	20.0	809475	150.003	3.322	7.184	339.5
Ethyl Lean-Burn	20.0	809476	158.684	3.953	7.598	381.0
	21.0	809345	154.993	3.313	7.385	340.5
	33.5	809332	107.788	3.482	7.635	257.2
	40.0	809474	105.557	3.176	7.686	253.3
	40.0	809571	115.058	2.934	7.966	296.6
	40.0	809572	108.803	3.324	7.534	285.9
	60.0	809477	36.001	3.570	8.609	129.2
	60.0	809478	63.548	3.206	8.757	199.4
	60.0	809479	59.767	2.479	7.610	172.4
	70.0	809205	15.382	3.838	7.382	83.0
	73.5	809006	48.858	3.281	5.670	133.9
	75.0	809209	16.260	3.316	8.558	78.2
	75.0	809349	19.304	2.527	8.317	103.7
	75.0	809350	19.817	2.699	7.491	92.2
	75.0	809573	14.389	2.799	8.327	119.9
	75.0	809582	15.860	2.626	10.614	122.9
1X69L7L104103	20.0	808193	37.131	0.398	0.776	298.8
Dresser '77 Nova	20.0	808199	29.861	0.098	0.645	264.4
	28.0	808195	18.898	0.044	0.344	207.9
	40.0	808189	9.574	1.003	1.229	186.6
	40.0	808191	12.543	0.804	0.959	156.8
	40.0	808200	5.241	0.816	0.979	180.7
	40.0	808202	12.264	1.277	1.125	182.6
	60.0	808185	4.464	1.511	4.701	87.9
	60.0	808187	4.325	1.555	1.095	102.8
	60.0	808205	5.679	1.836	2.757	89.8
	60.0	808455	4.046	1.935	1.849	170.3
	60.0	808464	4.059	2.729	2.119	133.2
	72.0	808112	3.527	1.291	1.785	106.7
	75.0	808149	3.618	1.105	1.735	104.0
	75.0	808181	2.320	1.151	1.108	70.9
	75.0	808183	2.230	1.012	0.858	59.7
	75.0	808463	3.022	1.417	1.164	121.6

Figure 01

Scatter Plot of Bag-1 (1), Bag-2 (2), Bag-3 (3) CO Emissions versus Ambient Temperature

Vehicle No. 9S1-5.8M-H-400, Ford 1979 California T-BIRD (351 cid)



Figure 02

Scatter Plot of Bag-1 (1), Bag-2 (2), Bag-3 (3) CO Emissions versus Ambient Temperature

Vehicle No. FB223, Nissan 1980 49-State 280ZX (168 cid)



Figure 03

Scatter Plot of Bag-1 (1), Bag-2 (2), Bag-3 (3) CO Emissions versus Ambient Temperature

Vehicle No. FB178, Nissan 1980 California 280ZX (168 cid)



Figure 04

Scatter Plot of Bag-1 (1), Bag-2 (2), Bag-3 (3) CO Emissions versus Ambient Temperature

Vehicle No. P0948, GM 1981 49-State GRAND PRIX (265 cid)



Figure 05

Scatter Plot of Bag-1 (1), Bag-2 (2), Bag-3 (3) CO Emissions versus Ambient Temperature

Vehicle No. 03H2-94472C, GM 1980 California CUTLASS SUPREME (260 cid)



Figure 06

Scatter Plot of Bag-1 (1), Bag-2 (2), Bag-3 (3) CO Emissions versus Ambient Temperature

Vehicle No. 8R10Y131386, Ford 1978 California PINTO (140 cid)



Figure 07

Scatter Plot of Bag-1 (1), Bag-2 (2), Bag-3 (3) CO Emissions versus Ambient Temperature

Vehicle No. 4M47AAH202725, GM 1980 50-State REGAL (231 cid)



Figure 08

Scatter Plot of Bag-1 (1), Bag-2 (2), Bag-3 (3) CO Emissions versus Ambient Temperature

Vehicle No. FB289, Nissan 1981.5 49-State 280ZX TURBO (168 cid)



Figure 09

Scatter Plot of Bag-1 (1), Bag-2 (2), Bag-3 (3) CO Emissions versus Ambient Temperature

Vehicle No. D162, Plymouth 1981 49-State RELIANT (135 cid)



Figure 10

Scatter Plot of Bag-1 (1), Bag-2 (2), Bag-3 (3) CO Emissions versus Ambient Temperature

Vehicle No. MA46100183, Toyota 1980 50-State CELICA SUPRA (156 cid)



Figure 11

Scatter Plot of Bag-1 (1), Bag-2 (2), Bag-3 (3) CO Emissions versus Ambient Temperature

Vehicle No. 838K26B4BC184143, Chrysler 1981 K-CAR (135 cid)



Figure 12

Scatter Plot of Bag-1 (1), Bag-2 (2), Bag-3 (3) CO Emissions versus Ambient Temperature

Vehicle No. 1FABP082XBW20356, Ford 1981 ESCORT WAGON (98 cid)



Figure 13

Scatter Plot of Bag-1 (1), Bag-2 (2), Bag-3 (3) CO Emissions versus Ambient Temperature

Vehicle No. 1FABP2183BK15310, Ford 1981 FAIRMONT (200 cid)



Figure 14

Scatter Plot of Bag-1 (1), Bag-2 (2), Bag-3 (3) CO Emissions versus Ambient Temperature

Vehicle No. 1G1AX68X7B621755, GM 1981 CITATION (173 cid)



Figure 15

Scatter Plot of Bag-1 (1), Bag-2 (2), Bag-3 (3) CO Emissions versus Ambient Temperature

Vehicle No. 2G1AW69J6B144479, GM 1981 MALIBU (267 cid)



Figure 16

Scatter Plot of Bag-1 (1), Bag-2 (2), Bag-3 (3) CO Emissions versus Ambient Temperature

Vehicle No. D160, Chrysler 1981 K-CAR (WGN) (135 cid)



Figure 17

Scatter Plot of Bag-1 (1), Bag-2 (2), Bag-3 (3) CO Emissions versus Ambient Temperature

Vehicle No. 1009, Ethyl Lean-Burn Car (163 cid)



Figure 18

Scatter Plot of Bag-1 (1), Bag-2 (2), Bag-3 (3) CO Emissions versus Ambient Temperature

Vehicle No. 1X89L7L104103, Dresser 1977 NOVA (350 cid)



APPENDIX 3

Equations Modeling CO Emissions for Each Vehicle

Models Predicting Cold-Start CO Emissions for Vehicle 9S1-5.8M-H-400, Ford 1979 California T-BIRD (351 cid)

N	Temp Interval	Equation	R-SQR	SE
8	20.0 - 101.0	BAG1 CO = 243.77 - 2.4142(TEMP)	96.361%	13.024
8	20.0 - 101.0	BAG1 CO = 271.94 - 3.5045(TEMP) + 0.008775(TEMP.2)	97.513%	11.795
8	20.0 - 101.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 239.69 - 2.5036(TEMP)	97.643%	10.798
8	20.0 - 101.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 255.04 - 3.0978(TEMP) + 0.004781(TEMP.2)	97.965%	10.990
6	20.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 263.44 - 2.7977(TEMP)	97.901%	9.7014
6	20.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 218.47 - 0.3004(TEMP) - 0.026278(TEMP.2)	99.675%	4.4069
6	20.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 252.55 - 2.7541(TEMP)	97.670%	10.073
6	20.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 207.80 - 0.2685(TEMP) - 0.026155(TEMP.2)	99.480%	5.4965

Models Predicting Cold-Start CO Emissions for Vehicle FB223, Nissan 1980 49-State 280ZX (168 cid)

N	Temp Interval	Equation	R-SQR	SE
11	21.0 - 100.0	BAG1 CO = 20.14 - 0.1397(TEMP)	52.248%	3.8891
11	21.0 - 100.0	BAG1 CO = 33.63 - 0.7044(TEMP) + 0.004667(TEMP.2)	93.198%	1.5568
11	21.0 - 100.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 20.49 - 0.1586(TEMP)	60.513%	3.7312
11	21.0 - 100.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 33.20 - 0.6910(TEMP) + 0.004400(TEMP.2)	93.214%	1.6406
8	21.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 25.33 - 0.2514(TEMP)	86.508%	2.4969
8	21.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 37.97 - 0.9578(TEMP) + 0.007391(TEMP.2)	96.081%	1.4742
8	21.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 25.44 - 0.2653(TEMP)	87.676%	2.5013
8	21.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 36.49 - 0.8832(TEMP) + 0.006466(TEMP.2)	94.344%	1.8562

Models Predicting Cold-Start CO Emissions for Vehicle FB178, Nissan 1980 California 280ZX (168 cid)

N	Temp Interval	Equation	R-SQR	SE
8	20.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 35.26 - 0.3543(TEMP)	88.253%	3.3581
8	20.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 47.52 - 1.0732(TEMP) + 0.007627(TEMP.2)	93.684%	2.6973
8	20.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 33.68 - 0.3465(TEMP)	88.711%	3.2115
8	20.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 45.28 - 1.0270(TEMP) + 0.007219(TEMP.2)	93.824%	2.6022

Models Predicting Cold-Start CO Emissions for Vehicle P0948, GM 1981 49-State GRAND PRIX (265 cid)

N	Temp Interval	Equation	R-SQR	SE
8	20.0 - 101.0	BAG1 CO = 183.30 - 1.9388(TEMP)	91.386%	20.055
8	20.0 - 101.0	BAG1 CO = 216.13 - 3.4312(TEMP) + 0.012672(TEMP.2)	94.005%	18.328
8	20.0 - 101.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 182.37 - 1.9479(TEMP)	90.798%	20.893
8	20.0 - 101.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 216.19 - 3.4853(TEMP) + 0.013054(TEMP.2)	93.533%	19.186
6	20.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 202.86 - 2.4204(TEMP)	95.054%	15.698
6	20.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 138.46 + 1.4226(TEMP) - 0.041813(TEMP.2)	98.994%	8.1756
6	20.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 202.67 - 2.4475(TEMP)	94.710%	16.446
6	20.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 134.29 + 1.6330(TEMP) - 0.044398(TEMP.2)	99.038%	8.0966

Models Predicting Cold-Start CO Emissions for Vehicle 03H2-94472C, GM 1980 California CUTLASS SUPREME (260 cid)

N	Temp Interval	Equation	R-SQR	SE
9	20.0 - 100.0	BAG1 CO = 121.04 - 1.2843(TEMP)	91.485%	12.239
9	20.0 - 100.0	BAG1 CO = 154.50 - 2.8024(TEMP) + 0.013078(TEMP.2)	98.049%	6.3276
9	20.0 - 100.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 120.88 - 1.2965(TEMP)	92.102%	11.859
9	20.0 - 100.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 153.25 - 2.7651(TEMP) + 0.012652(TEMP.2)	98.170%	6.1660
7	20.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 136.06 - 1.6304(TEMP)	99.273%	3.8044
7	20.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 126.57 - 1.0654(TEMP) - 0.006063(TEMP.2)	99.441%	3.7300
7	20.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 135.42 - 1.6315(TEMP)	99.299%	3.7373
7	20.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 126.09 - 1.0761(TEMP) - 0.005960(TEMP.2)	99.461%	3.6634

Models Predicting Cold-Start CO Emissions for Vehicle 8R10Y131366, Ford 1978 California PINTO (140 cid)

N	Temp Interval	Equation	R-SQR	SE
8	20.0 - 100.0	BAG1 CO = 108.14 - 1.1267(TEMP)	92.636%	10.645
8	20.0 - 100.0	BAG1 CO = 137.33 - 2.4607(TEMP) + 0.011384(TEMP.2)	98.843%	4.6213
8	20.0 - 100.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 87.23 - 0.8985(TEMP)	95.672%	6.4039
8	20.0 - 100.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 99.72 - 1.4695(TEMP) + 0.004872(TEMP.2)	97.519%	5.3116
6	20.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 118.69 - 1.3872(TEMP)	96.128%	7.9148
6	20.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 150.96 - 3.3125(TEMP) + 0.020948(TEMP.2)	99.173%	4.2231
6	20.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 91.49 - 1.0037(TEMP)	95.020%	6.5325
6	20.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 108.69 - 2.0305(TEMP) + 0.011172(TEMP.2)	96.656%	6.1817

Models Predicting Cold-Start CO Emissions for Vehicle 4M47AAH202725, GM 1980 50-State REGAL (231 cid)

N	Temp Interval	Equation	R-SQR	SE
7	20.0 - 100.0	BAG1 CO = 67.77 - 0.6342(TEMP)	88.452%	8.3322
7	20.0 - 100.0	BAG1 CO = 88.62 - 1.6013(TEMP) + 0.008171(TEMP.2)	97.336%	4.4691
7	20.0 - 100.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 64.55 - 0.6899(TEMP)	91.975%	7.3988
7	20.0 - 100.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 82.66 - 1.5298(TEMP) + 0.007096(TEMP.2)	97.883%	4.2490
5	20.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 75.70 - 0.8469(TEMP)	92.307%	7.1699
5	20.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 102.41 - 2.4794(TEMP) + 0.018352(TEMP.2)	97.980%	4.5000
5	20.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 71.37 - 0.8728(TEMP)	93.724%	6.6236
5	20.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 95.53 - 2.3490(TEMP) + 0.016595(TEMP.2)	98.158%	4.3943

Models Predicting Cold-Start CO Emissions for Vehicle FB289, Nissan 1981.5 49-State 280ZX TURBO (168 cid)

N	Temp Interval	Equation	R-SQR	SE
12	20.0 - 100.0	BAG1 CO = 16.41 - 0.1503(TEMP)	66.350%	3.3588
12	20.0 - 100.0	BAG1 CO = 22.75 - 0.4571(TEMP) + 0.002740(TEMP.2)	80.695%	2.6817
12	20.0 - 100.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 15.40 - 0.1469(TEMP)	65.076%	3.3760
12	20.0 - 100.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 21.63 - 0.4487(TEMP) + 0.002696(TEMP.2)	79.344%	2.7368
10	20.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 18.90 - 0.2172(TEMP)	79.359%	2.8127
10	20.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 20.83 - 0.3348(TEMP) + 0.001322(TEMP.2)	79.744%	2.9788
10	20.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 17.81 - 0.2117(TEMP)	77.404%	2.9051
10	20.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 20.21 - 0.3581(TEMP) + 0.001646(TEMP.2)	78.016%	3.0633

Models Predicting Cold-Start CO Emissions for Vehicle D182, Plymouth 1981 49-State RELIANT (135 cid)

N	Temp Interval	Equation	R-SQR	SE
9	20.0 - 100.0	BAG1 CO = 56.10 - 0.5492(TEMP)	88.577%	7.5771
9	20.0 - 100.0	BAG1 CO = 79.74 - 1.6038(TEMP) + 0.008742(TEMP.2)	99.194%	1.9352
9	20.0 - 100.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 53.21 - 0.5412(TEMP)	84.323%	7.8418
9	20.0 - 100.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 77.57 - 1.6277(TEMP) + 0.009006(TEMP.2)	98.989%	2.1513
6	20.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 66.29 - 0.8007(TEMP)	97.392%	3.7251
6	20.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 79.59 - 1.5939(TEMP) + 0.008631(TEMP.2)	98.964%	2.7112
6	20.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 63.78 - 0.8020(TEMP)	97.380%	3.7397
6	20.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 76.54 - 1.5635(TEMP) + 0.008286(TEMP.2)	98.824%	2.8933

Models Predicting Cold-Start CO Emissions for Vehicle MA48100183, Toyota 1980 50-State CELICA SUPRA (158 cid)

N	Temp Interval	Equation	R-SQR	SE
14	20.0 - 100.0	BAG1 CO = 41.60 - 0.4448(TEMP)	89.463%	3.7156
14	20.0 - 100.0	BAG1 CO = 54.46 - 1.0045(TEMP) + 0.004906(TEMP.2)	98.207%	1.6008
14	20.0 - 100.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 41.09 - 0.4424(TEMP)	89.813%	3.6264
14	20.0 - 100.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 53.65 - 0.9889(TEMP) + 0.004790(TEMP.2)	98.273%	1.5594
12	20.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 46.53 - 0.5392(TEMP)	97.287%	1.9615
12	20.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 53.56 - 0.9494(TEMP) + 0.004314(TEMP.2)	98.028%	1.7629
12	20.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 45.91 - 0.5347(TEMP)	97.416%	1.8974
12	20.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 52.62 - 0.9259(TEMP) + 0.004113(TEMP.2)	98.101%	1.7144

Models Predicting Cold-Start CO Emissions for Vehicle B3BK26B4BC184143, Chrysler 1981 K-CAR (135 cid)

N	Temp Interval	Equation	R-SQR	SE
4	22.0 - 97.0	BAG1 CO = 142.56 - 1.5394(TEMP)	82.481%	27.213
4	22.0 - 97.0	BAG1 CO = 216.85 - 4.8156(TEMP) + 0.028103(TEMP.2)	98.769%	10.201
4	22.0 - 97.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 135.25 - 1.4874(TEMP)	81.237%	27.419
4	22.0 - 97.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 209.36 - 4.7563(TEMP) + 0.028040(TEMP.2)	98.345%	11.516
3	22.0 - 72.5	BAG1 CO = 168.98 - 2.1801(TEMP)	93.755%	20.805
3	22.0 - 72.5	BAG1 CO = 254.28 - 7.0206(TEMP) + 0.052822(TEMP.2)	100.00%	0.000
3	22.0 - 72.5	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 161.27 - 2.1188(TEMP)	92.668%	22.036
3	22.0 - 72.5	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 251.63 - 7.2458(TEMP) + 0.055948(TEMP.2)	100.00%	0.000

Models Predicting Cold-Start CO Emissions for Vehicle 1FABP082XBW20356, Ford 1981 ESCORT WAGON (98 cid)

N	Temp Interval	Equation	R-SQR	SE
4	23.0 - 98.0	BAG1 CO = 87.48 - 0.9255(TEMP)	77.191%	19.444
4	23.0 - 98.0	BAG1 CO = 144.79 - 3.3876(TEMP) + 0.020716(TEMP.2)	99.136%	5.3520
4	23.0 - 98.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 70.74 - 0.7947(TEMP)	81.790%	14.494
4	23.0 - 98.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 113.56 - 2.6341(TEMP) + 0.015476(TEMP.2)	99.388%	3.7578
3	23.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 106.30 - 1.3747(TEMP)	92.520%	14.689
3	23.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 162.27 - 4.3683(TEMP) + 0.031388(TEMP.2)	100.00%	0.000
3	23.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 84.87 - 1.1320(TEMP)	93.998%	10.749
3	23.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 125.83 - 3.3226(TEMP) + 0.022969(TEMP.2)	100.00%	0.000

Models Predicting Cold-Start CO Emissions for Vehicle 1FABP21B3BK15310, Ford 1981 FAIRMONT (200 cid)

N	Temp Interval	Equation	R-SQR	SE
4	22.2 - 100.0	BAG1 CO = 147.60 - 1.7355(TEMP)	72.709%	42.317
4	22.2 - 100.0	BAG1 CO = 262.10 - 6.6433(TEMP) + 0.040848(TEMP.2)	98.626%	13.427
4	22.2 - 100.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 142.40 - 1.6900(TEMP)	73.521%	40.366
4	22.2 - 100.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 251.74 - 6.3769(TEMP) + 0.039009(TEMP.2)	98.724%	12.533
3	22.2 - 74.0	BAG1 CO = 190.04 - 2.7480(TEMP)	91.939%	30.670
3	22.2 - 74.0	BAG1 CO = 307.74 - 9.2870(TEMP) + 0.070029(TEMP.2)	100.00%	0.000
3	22.2 - 74.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 183.01 - 2.6587(TEMP)	92.267%	29.013
3	22.2 - 74.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 294.35 - 8.8445(TEMP) + 0.066246(TEMP.2)	100.00%	0.000

Models Predicting Cold-Start CO Emissions for Vehicle 1G1AX68X7B621755, GM 1981 CITATION (173 cid)

N	Temp Interval	Equation	R-SQR	SE
4	22.0 - 101.5	BAG1 CO = 66.61 - 0.6064(TEMP)	90.813%	7.8367
4	22.0 - 101.5	BAG1 CO = 87.55 - 1.5036(TEMP) + 0.007404(TEMP.2)	99.922%	1.0192
4	22.0 - 101.5	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 63.76 - 0.6142(TEMP)	91.245%	7.7294
4	22.0 - 101.5	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 84.49 - 1.5026(TEMP) + 0.007332(TEMP.2)	99.996%	0.2334
3	22.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 74.87 - 0.8017(TEMP)	98.171%	4.2385
3	22.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 91.01 - 1.7054(TEMP) + 0.009612(TEMP.2)	100.00%	0.000
3	22.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 72.12 - 0.8119(TEMP)	98.807%	3.4562
3	22.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 85.28 - 1.5488(TEMP) + 0.007837(TEMP.2)	100.00%	0.000

Models Predicting Cold-Start CO Emissions for Vehicle 2G1AW69J6B144479, GM 1981 MALIBU (267 cid)

N	Temp Interval	Equation	R-SQR	SE
3	18.7 - 73.6	BAG1 CO = 173.81 - 2.4327(TEMP)	94.264%	24.263
3	18.7 - 73.6	BAG1 CO = 251.10 - 7.3439(TEMP) + 0.055104(TEMP.2)	100.00%	0.000
3	18.7 - 73.6	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 171.82 - 2.4367(TEMP)	93.894%	25.124
3	18.7 - 73.6	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 253.35 - 7.6276(TEMP) + 0.058399(TEMP.2)	100.00%	0.000

Models Predicting Cold-Start CO Emissions for Vehicle D160, Chrysler 1981 K-CAR (WGN) (135 cid)

N	Temp Interval	Equation	R-SQR	SE
6	20.0 - 100.0	BAG1 CO = 104.27 - 1.0856(TEMP)	84.355%	15.564
6	20.0 - 100.0	BAG1 CO = 154.28 - 3.2073(TEMP) + 0.017371(TEMP.2)	99.785%	2.1075
6	20.0 - 100.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 101.55 - 1.0821(TEMP)	83.913%	15.773
6	20.0 - 100.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 152.23 - 3.2326(TEMP) + 0.017606(TEMP.2)	99.784%	2.1128
4	20.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 125.57 - 1.5527(TEMP)	96.913%	8.8177
4	20.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 164.20 - 3.8180(TEMP) + 0.024032(TEMP.2)	99.996%	0.4561
4	20.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 123.15 - 1.5559(TEMP)	96.871%	8.8977
4	20.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 162.10 - 3.8399(TEMP) + 0.024232(TEMP.2)	99.991%	0.6760

Models Predicting Cold-Start CO Emissions for Vehicle 1009, Ethyl Lean-Burn Car (163 cid)

N	Temp Interval	Equation	R-SQR	SE
17	20.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 203.48 - 2.4633(TEMP)	96.158%	10.905
17	20.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 208.03 - 2.6914(TEMP) + 0.002318(TEMP.2)	96.175%	11.263
17	20.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 196.30 - 2.4769(TEMP)	95.890%	11.357
17	20.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 201.20 - 2.7219(TEMP) + 0.002490(TEMP.2)	95.909%	11.728

Models Predicting Cold-Start CO Emissions for Vehicle 1X69L7L104103, Dresser 1977 NOVA (350 cid)

N	Temp Interval	Equation	R-SQR	SE
17	20.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 33.47 - 0.4513(TEMP)	74.603%	5.2759
17	20.0 - 75.0	BAG1 CO = 63.05 - 1.8657(TEMP) + 0.014350(TEMP.2)	93.274%	2.8104
17	20.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 33.03 - 0.4711(TEMP)	74.506%	5.5207
17	20.0 - 75.0	(BAG1 - BAG3) CO = 65.31 - 2.0145(TEMP) + 0.015659(TEMP.2)	94.889%	2.5586

APPENDIX 4

Correlation Coefficients between:

1. Difference in (actual) CO emissions from Bag 3 to Bag 1 and the corresponding differences in fuel consumption. (Stratified by temperature)

2. Actual CO emissions (from Appendix 1) and vehicle parameters.

3. Predicted CO emissions (from Appendix 3) and vehicle parameters.

4. Pairs of vehicle parameters.

KEY:

AIR: 0 = No secondary air; 1 = Has secondary air.

PMP/PLS: 0 = Pulse air; 1 = Air pump. (Missing = No air.)

OXD: 1 = Has only oxidation catalyst; 0 = Otherwise.

3WY: 1 = Has only three-way catalyst; 0 = Otherwise.

BOTH: 1 = Has both oxidation and three-way catalysts;
0 = Otherwise.

#CAT: Number of catalyst(s) (0, 1, or 2)

TYPE: 0 = Monolith Catalyst; 1 = Pelleted Catalyst.

FS: 0 = EFI; 1 = Carbureted. (FS: Fuel Metering System)

A/F: 0 = Open-loop air/fuel (A/F) control;
1 = Closed-loop A/F.

EGR: 0 = No Exhaust Gas Recirculation (EGR); 1 = Has EGR.

ETW: Equivalent Test Weight (pounds)

#CYL: Number of cylinders (4, 6, or 8)

Correlation Matrices for ACTUAL Emission & Fuel Consumption Data (from Appendix 1).

Correlation Coefficients between the Increase in Bag 3 to Bag 1 CO Emissions and the Corresponding Increase in Fuel Consumed for All 18 Vehicles.

Temp	Correlation Coefficients						
20°F	0.7159	(N= 33	DF= 31	R@ .0500= .3440	R@ .0100= .4421)‡		
30°F	N/A	(TOO FEW CASES FOR ANALYSIS)					
40°F	0.9638	(N= 7	DF= 5	R@ .0500= .7545	R@ .0100= .8745)		
60°F	0.7799	(N= 36	DF= 34	R@ .0500= .3291	R@ .0100= .4238)		
75°F	0.4721	(N= 50	DF= 48	R@ .0500= .2787	R@ .0100= .3610)		
100°F	-0.1991	(N= 26	DF= 24	R@ .0500= .3882	R@ .0100= .4958)		

Correlation Coefficients between the Increase in Bag 3 to Bag 1 CO Emissions and the Corresponding Increase in Fuel Consumed for 16 Vehicles (All Cars Except the Ethyl and Dresser Cars)

Temp	Correlation Coefficients						
20°F	0.6972	(N= 27	DF= 25	R@ .0500= .3809	R@ .0100= .4869)		
60°F	0.8038	(N= 28	DF= 26	R@ .0500= .3739	R@ .0100= .4785)		
75°F	0.5006	(N= 38	DF= 36	R@ .0500= .3202	R@ .0100= .4128)		
100°F	-0.1991	(N= 26	DF= 24	R@ .0500= .3882	R@ .0100= .4958)		

---

‡ 'N' is sample size, 'DF' is degrees of freedom.

'R@ .0500= .3440' indicates that the correlation coefficient which corresponds to the '.0500' significance level is '.3440'

Correlation Coefficients between Pairs of Actual Data (Appendix 1) and Vehicle Parameters, Stratified by Ambient Temperature:

Correlation Matrices for All Vehicles Except the Ethyl & Dresser Cars

ACTUAL VARIABLE												
Temperature = 20°F, N= 27 DF= 25 R@ .0500= .3809 R@ .0100= .4869:												
Bag 1 CO	.6330	.7436	.0554	-.5329	.4979	.3873	.4114	.7570	-.1727	.2346	.4438	.3417
Delta Fuel*	.3372	.4151	-.0696	-.1787	.2227	.2091	.7375	.4257	.2251	.0649	.6916	.6149
Delta CO	.6096	.7152	.0620	-.5014	.4622	.3597	.4484	.7275	-.1551	.2334	.4925	.4087
Temperature = 60°F, N= 28 DF= 26 R@ .0500= .3739 R@ .0100= .4785:												
Bag 1 CO	.4024	.4687	.4385	-.3364	.0263	-.0455	.2585	.4808	-.2656	.1629	.6484	.5392
Delta Fuel	.2372	.2798	.3220	-.1983	-.0293	-.0398	.4847	.2426	-.2193	.1223	.8043	.7459
Delta CO	.3869	.4509	.4265	-.3304	.0289	-.0363	.2653	.4604	-.2498	.1853	.6451	.5547
Temperature = 75°F, N= 38 DF= 36 R@ .0500= .3202 R@ .0100= .4125:												
Bag 1 CO	.4007	.4649	.4991	-.3672	-.0213	-.2561	-.0377	.4895	-.3946	.0468	.5275	.2826
Delta Fuel	.1069	.1393	.3675	-.0924	-.2031	-.1884	.1812	.1236	-.2623	.0818	.6042	.5323
Delta CO	.3525	.4166	.4938	-.3221	-.0645	-.2620	-.0602	.4395	-.3635	.0625	.5025	.2906
	AIR	**PMP/PLS**	**OXD**	**3WY**	**BOTH**	**#CAT**	**TYPE**	**FS**	**A/F**	**EGR**	**ETW**	**#CYL**

Correlation Matrices for All 18 Vehicles:

ACTUAL VARIABLE												
Temperature = 20°F, N= 33 DF= 31 R@ .0500= .3440 R@ .0100= .4421:												
Bag 1 CO	.6781	.7728	.0271	-.6195	.3505	-.0139	-.1472	.6561	-.1981	.2206	.0596	.1497
Delta Fuel	.3372	.4146	-.1042	-.2426	.0919	-.1186	.2259	.4562	-.0308	.1069	.4104	.5143
Delta CO	.6575	.7490	.0320	-.5928	.3218	-.0301	-.1184	.6373	-.1917	.2217	.1007	.2082
Temperature = 60°F, N= 36 DF= 34 R@ .0500= .3291 R@ .0100= .4238:												
Bag 1 CO	.5098	.5647	.3998	-.4594	.0430	-.1464	-.1595	.3918	-.1412	.1342	.2423	.0771
Delta Fuel	.2730	.3130	.2780	-.2572	-.0541	-.1614	.1005	.2359	-.2013	.1250	.4659	.8502
Delta CO	.4994	.5509	.4004	-.4506	.0616	-.1044	-.1320	.3634	-.1091	.1472	.2473	.2868
Temperature = 75°F, N= 50 DF= 48 R@ .0500= .2787 R@ .0100= .3610:												
Bag 1 CO	.4829	.5341	.4120	-.4568	-.0223	-.2782	-.3198	.3860	-.2635	.0422	.1539	.0807
Delta Fuel	.1318	.1617	.3224	-.1244	-.1970	-.1810	.0050	.1276	-.2198	.0852	.3983	.4229
Delta CO	.3987	.4403	.4315	-.3644	-.0131	-.1533	-.2177	.2877	-.1545	.0303	.1809	.0880
	AIR	**PMP/PLS**	**OXD**	**3WY**	**BOTH**	**#CAT**	**TYPE**	**FS**	**A/F**	**EGR**	**ETW**	**#CYL**

---

* Delta Fuel = Total fuel consumed (in grams) during Bag 1 minus total fuel consumed during the corresponding Bag 3.

Delta CO = CO Emissions (grams per mile) during Bag 1 minus corresponding Bag 3 CO Emissions.

Correlation Matrices for PREDICTED Bag 1 CO (Appendix 3) for All 18 Vehicles

Correlation Coefficients for Linear Model with No Data from Tests Over 90°F

N= 17 DF= 15 R@ .0500= .4821 R@ .0100= .6055

PREDICTED VARIABLE	AIR	PMP/PLS	OXD	3WY	BOTH	#CAT	TYPE	FS	A/F	EGR	ETW	#CYL
CO @ 20°F	.5981	.7155	.2035	-.5435	.2351	-.0197	-.0467	.6088	-.1580	.2736	.2833	.2491
CO @ 40°F	.5843	.6925	.2536	-.5255	.1897	-.0510	-.0686	.5848	-.1778	.2527	.3140	.2586
CO @ 75°F	.4174	.4600	.4792	-.3462	-.0813	-.2089	-.1738	.3642	-.2540	.1014	.4269	.2679
Slope@20°F	-.6097	-.7434	-.0864	.5658	-.3277	-.0500	-.0030	-.6423	.1095	-.3110	-.2065	-.2202
Slope@40°F	-.6097	-.7434	-.0864	.5658	-.3277	-.0500	-.0030	-.6423	.1095	-.3110	-.2065	-.2202
Slope@75°F	-.6097	-.7434	-.0864	.5658	-.3277	-.0500	-.0030	-.6423	.1095	-.3110	-.2065	-.2202
RATIO*	.0663	.1392	-.1919	-.1460	.2926	.2297	.4146	.2561	.0455	.1780	.1721	.3109
Sen* @ 20°F	-.0829	-.2707	.5049	.1332	-.4265	-.3057	-.3199	-.5296	.0022	-.3964	.0887	-.0153
Sen @ 40°F	-.0739	-.2522	.4783	.1350	-.4178	-.2996	-.3344	-.5118	.0183	-.3825	.0664	-.0404
Sen @ 75°F	-.0663	-.1392	.1919	.1460	-.2926	-.2297	-.4146	-.2561	-.0455	-.1780	-.1721	-.3109
DIFF*	.6097	.7434	.0864	-.5658	.3277	.0500	.0030	.6423	-.1095	.3110	.2065	.2202

Correlation Coefficients for Linear Model with Data from Tests up to 105°F

N= 18 DF= 16 R@ .0500= .4683 R@ .0100= .5897

PREDICTED VARIABLE	AIR	PMP/PLS	OXD	3WY	BOTH	#CAT	TYPE	FS	A/F	EGR	ETW	#CYL
CO @ 20°F	.5867	.7038	.1812	-.5415	.2351	-.0256	-.0642	.6054	-.2111	.2700	.3060	.2804
CO @ 40°F	.5946	.7035	.2250	-.5364	.2195	-.0249	-.0771	.5978	-.2071	.2557	.3166	.2579
CO @ 75°F	.5300	.5835	.3833	-.4236	.1130	-.0176	-.1215	.4636	-.1547	.1485	.3106	.1145
Slope@20°F	-.5379	-.6685	-.0690	.5255	-.2595	.0260	.0308	-.5919	.2094	-.2898	-.2654	-.3184
Slope@40°F	-.5379	-.6685	-.0690	.5255	-.2595	.0260	.0308	-.5919	.2094	-.2898	-.2654	-.3184
Slope@75°F	-.5379	-.6685	-.0690	.5255	-.2595	.0260	.0308	-.5919	.2094	-.2898	-.2654	-.3184
RATIO	.0024	.0603	-.1450	-.0815	.1730	.1219	.4160	.1986	.0342	.1276	.2545	.4115
Sen @ 20°F	.1054	-.0962	.4493	-.0040	-.1696	-.0555	-.2641	-.4374	.1326	-.1950	-.1676	-.3333
Sen @ 40°F	.1079	-.0702	.3993	.0005	-.1492	-.0375	-.2906	-.4065	.1536	-.2001	-.1959	-.3661
Sen @ 75°F	-.0024	-.0603	.1450	.0815	-.1729	-.1218	-.4160	-.1986	-.0341	-.1276	-.2546	-.4115
DIFF	.5379	.6685	.0690	-.5255	.2595	-.0260	-.0308	.5919	-.2094	.2898	.2654	.3184

---

* RATIO = Bag 1 CO at 20°F divided by Bag 1 CO at 75°F.

DIFF = Bag 1 CO at 20°F minus by Bag 1 CO at 75°F.

Sen (Sensitivity) = $\frac{\partial(CO)}{CO} / \frac{\partial(Temp)}{Temp}$

Correlation Matrices for PREDICTED Bag 1 CO (Appendix 3) for All 18 Vehicles

Correlation Coefficients for Quadratic Model with No Data from Tests Over 90°F

N= 18 DF= 16 R@ .0500= .4683 R@ .0100= .5897

PREDICTED VARIABLE	AIR	PMP/PLS	OXD	3WY	BOTH	#CAT	TYPE	FS	A/F	EGR	ETW	#CYL
CO @ 20°F	.6143	.7343	.1506	-.5756	.3105	.0523	-.0798	.6386	-.2495	.2952	.2577	.2077
CO @ 40°F	.4808	.5691	.3106	-.4154	.0551	-.1381	-.0499	.4804	-.1892	.2349	.4086	.3576
CO @ 75°F	.3860	.4236	.4741	-.2905	-.1231	-.2391	-.1088	.3480	-.1303	.0689	.4166	.2675
Slope@20°F	-.4211	-.5101	.2321	.4554	-.5460	-.3570	.0866	-.4697	.1799	-.1811	.2016	.2265
Slope@40°F	-.5912	-.7187	.0706	.5936	-.4981	-.2336	.0733	-.6395	.2500	-.3061	-.0488	-.0338
Slope@75°F	-.2413	-.2968	-.3030	.1830	.1456	.2525	-.0328	-.2351	.0987	-.1923	-.4512	-.4710
RATIO	.1305	.1711	-.1085	-.1823	.2689	.2224	-.0670	.1569	-.3477	.1077	.0673	.0191
Sen @ 20°F	.0606	.0646	.2250	.0483	-.2755	-.2673	-.0503	-.0652	.2017	.0615	.2725	.3265
Sen @ 40°F	-.0086	-.0664	.2554	.1409	-.3684	-.3216	-.1690	-.2514	.3114	-.1310	.0624	.0840
Sen @ 75°F	.0708	.0859	-.0824	-.1421	.2480	.2261	-.0582	.1047	-.3645	.0261	.0367	-.0494
DIFF	.6076	.7396	.0166	-.5942	.4181	.1466	-.0585	.6503	-.2560	.3327	.1661	.1576

Correlation Coefficients for Quadratic Model with Data from Tests up to 105°F

N= 17 DF= 15 R@ .0500= .4821 R@ .0100= .6055

PREDICTED VARIABLE	AIR	PMP/PLS	OXD	3WY	BOTH	#CAT	TYPE	FS	A/F	EGR	ETW	#CYL
CO @ 20°F	.6009	.7207	.1910	-.5509	.2500	-.0108	-.0476	.6272	-.1721	.2818	.2683	.2325
CO @ 40°F	.5470	.6436	.2905	-.4858	.1034	-.1344	-.1463	.5411	-.2279	.2348	.3102	.2393
CO @ 75°F	.4180	.4662	.4693	-.3496	-.0643	-.1933	-.1137	.3791	-.2383	.1145	.4784	.3264
Slope@20°F	-.5454	-.6785	.0543	.5325	-.4897	-.2629	-.1947	-.6322	.0024	-.2948	-.1320	-.1716
Slope@40°F	-.6091	-.7472	-.0345	.5769	-.3943	-.1178	-.0409	-.6694	.0979	-.3197	-.1579	-.1779
Slope@75°F	-.4472	-.5259	-.2328	.3851	.0429	.2965	.3546	-.4119	.2795	-.2139	-.1388	-.1006
RATIO	.0398	.1405	-.2780	-.1478	.3472	.2717	.3742	.3470	-.0804	.2460	.0442	.1644
Sen @ 20°F	.2788	.2237	.2705	-.1319	-.1874	-.2320	-.4381	-.0609	.0559	-.0546	-.0250	-.0915
Sen @ 40°F	.1778	.0916	.2861	-.0439	-.2194	-.2085	-.4436	-.2354	.1175	-.1712	-.0945	-.1800
Sen @ 75°F	-.4098	-.4531	.0669	.2943	-.1477	-.0127	.5490	-.1659	-.0486	-.1303	.4847	.5017
DIFF	.6160	.7522	.0669	-.5775	.3476	.0601	-.0179	.6648	-.1310	.3201	.1632	.1753

Correlation Matrices for PREDICTED Bag 1 CO (Appendix 3) for All Vehicles Except the Ethyl & Dresser Cars

Correlation Coefficients for Linear Model with No Data from Tests Over 90°F

N= 15 DF= 13 R@ .0500= .5140 R@ .0100= .6411

PREDICTED VARIABLE	AIR	PMP/PLS	OXD	3WY	BOTH	#CAT	TYPE	FS	A/F	EGR	ETW	#CYL
CO @ 20°F	.5454	.6797	.2311	-.4737	.2901	.1720	.3156	.6747	-.1826	.2979	.5311	.3867
CO @ 40°F	.5260	.6497	.2847	-.4515	.2327	.1170	.2785	.6488	-.2159	.2756	.5665	.3989
CO @ 75°F	.3325	.3799	.5080	-.2574	-.1030	-.1852	.0391	.4002	-.3473	.1125	.6468	.3902
Slope@20°F	-.5676	-.7202	-.1041	.5046	-.4059	-.2868	-.3854	-.7062	.1024	-.3356	-.4326	-.3450
Slope@40°F	-.5676	-.7202	-.1041	.5046	-.4059	-.2868	-.3854	-.7062	.1024	-.3356	-.4326	-.3450
Slope@75°F	-.5676	-.7202	-.1041	.5046	-.4059	-.2868	-.3854	-.7062	.1024	-.3356	-.4326	-.3450
RATIO	.1886	.2642	-.1837	-.2460	.3576	.3215	.4252	.2455	.1292	.1694	.1017	.2657
Sen @ 20°F	-.3050	-.5106	.5071	.2946	-.6239	-.6180	-.3269	-.5158	-.2391	-.3880	.2474	.1295
Sen @ 40°F	-.3048	-.4998	.4805	.3062	-.6167	-.6041	-.3323	-.4986	-.2186	-.3747	.2308	.1059
Sen @ 75°F	-.1887	-.2642	.1837	.2460	-.3576	-.3215	-.4252	-.2455	-.1291	-.1694	-.1017	-.2657
DIFF	.5676	.7202	.1041	-.5047	.4059	.2868	.3854	.7062	-.1024	.3356	.4326	.3450

Correlation Coefficients for Linear Model with Data from Tests up to 105°F

N= 16 DF= 14 R@ .0500= .4973 R@ .0100= .6226

PREDICTED VARIABLE	AIR	PMP/PLS	OXD	3WY	BOTH	#CAT	TYPE	FS	A/F	EGR	ETW	#CYL
CO @ 20°F	.5390	.6733	.2110	-.4765	.3045	.1883	.3058	.6698	-.2303	.2929	.5659	.4229
CO @ 40°F	.5391	.6643	.2523	-.4659	.2672	.1488	.2646	.6639	-.2484	.2799	.5717	.4007
CO @ 75°F	.4522	.5184	.3876	-.3458	.0647	-.0437	.0463	.5315	-.2854	.1794	.5041	.2414
Slope@20°F	-.5084	-.6570	-.0998	.4749	-.3771	-.2726	-.3875	-.6462	.1738	-.3075	-.5200	-.4524
Slope@40°F	-.5084	-.6570	-.0998	.4749	-.3771	-.2726	-.3875	-.6462	.1738	-.3075	-.5200	-.4524
Slope@75°F	-.5084	-.6570	-.0998	.4749	-.3771	-.2726	-.3875	-.6462	.1738	-.3075	-.5200	-.4524
RATIO	.1301	.1859	-.1288	-.1823	.2562	.2344	.4469	.1750	.1409	.1106	.1932	.3627
Sen @ 20°F	-.1105	-.3444	.4616	.1518	-.4495	-.4953	-.3721	-.4117	-.1743	-.1563	-.0782	-.2193
Sen @ 40°F	-.1255	-.3302	.4054	.1732	-.4321	-.4676	-.3933	-.3772	-.1523	-.1633	-.0995	-.2539
Sen @ 75°F	-.1301	-.1859	.1288	.1823	-.2562	-.2344	-.4469	-.1750	-.1409	-.1106	-.1932	-.3627
DIFF	.5084	.6570	.0999	-.4749	.3771	.2726	.3875	.6462	-.1738	.3075	.5200	.4524

Correlation Matrices for PREDICTED Bag 1 CO (Appendix 3) for All Vehicles Except the Ethyl & Dresser Cars

Correlation Coefficients for Quadratic Model with No Data from Tests Over 90°F

N= 16 DF= 14 R@ .0500= .4973 R@ .0100= .6226

PREDICTED VARIABLE	AIR	PMP/PLS	OXD	3WY	BOTH	#CAT	TYPE	FS	A/F	EGR	ETW	#CYL
CO @ 20°F	.5708	.7074	.1684	-.5176	.3714	.2509	.2351	.6997	-.2953	.3190	.4821	.3300
CO @ 40°F	.4171	.5156	.3452	-.3364	.0842	-.0059	.2727	.5186	-.2050	2491	.6518	.4918
CO @ 75°F	.3100	.3508	.5007	-.2054	-.1419	-.2208	.1111	.3740	-.1636	.0742	.6163	.3755
Slope@20°F	-.4116	-.5086	.2412	.4417	-.5735	-.4889	.0182	-.4904	.2332	-.1893	.1638	.2014
Slope@40°F	-.5592	-.7009	.0732	.5517	-.5643	-.4505	-.1649	-.6818	.2960	-.3225	-.1928	-.1106
Slope@75°F	-.1732	-.2308	-.3336	.1030	.1261	.1597	-.3165	-.2326	.0625	-.1913	-.6410	-.5720
RATIO	.1419	.1888	-.1178	-.1980	.2635	.2339	-.1208	.1727	-.4401	.1170	.0691	.0306
Sen @ 20°F	-.1298	-.1176	.2309	.2180	-.3576	-.3206	.2243	-.0511	.1893	.0803	.4964	.4902
Sen @ 40°F	-.2471	-.3054	.2600	.3498	-.5002	-.4519	.0631	-.2466	.2911	-.1223	.2703	.2410
Sen @ 75°F	.1258	.1443	-.0913	-.1981	.2459	.2068	-.1971	.1190	-.4590	.0339	-.0112	-.0699
DIFF	.5718	.7204	.0229	-.5454	.4944	.3786	.2414	.7030	-.2946	.3548	.3566	.2606

Correlation Coefficients for Quadratic Model with Data from Tests up to 105°F

N= 15 DF= 13 R@ .0500= .5140 R@ .0100= .6411

PREDICTED VARIABLE	AIR	PMP/PLS	OXD	3WY	BOTH	#CAT	TYPE	FS	A/F	EGR	ETW	#CYL
CO @ 20°F	.5572	.6925	.2183	-.4878	.3122	.1915	.3032	.6875	-.1881	.3027	.5013	.3570
CO @ 40°F	.4867	.5959	.3382	-.4055	.1527	.0475	.2067	.6001	-.2530	.2536	.5807	.3781
CO @ 75°F	.3411	.3947	.4936	-.2681	-.0830	-.1705	.1029	.4131	-.3245	.1255	.6912	.4469
Slope@20°F	-.5364	-.6819	.0588	.5103	-.5223	-.4034	-.4077	-.6613	.0182	-.3056	-.2283	-.2339
Slope@40°F	-.5802	-.7340	-.0448	.5286	-.4690	-.3465	-.3734	-.7179	.0879	-.3366	-.3367	-.2738
Slope@75°F	-.3764	-.4660	-.3293	.2781	-.0384	.0244	-.0550	-.4728	.2458	-.2352	-.4673	-.2351
RATIO	.2520	.3570	-.2689	-.3207	.4862	.4553	.3224	.3307	.0613	.2341	-.1059	.0526
Sen @ 20°F	-.0215	-.0877	.3185	.1539	-.3624	-.3186	-.1562	-.0234	-.1028	-.0343	.3319	.1306
Sen @ 40°F	-.1623	-.2617	.3133	.2544	-.4538	-.4217	-.2710	-.2210	-.1062	-.1648	.2036	.0233
Sen @ 75°F	-.1683	-.2409	.1185	.0610	-.1385	-.1976	.2837	-.2711	.0594	-.2051	.3144	.4569
DIFF	.5848	.7384	.0856	-.5241	.4369	.3157	.3511	.7245	-.1140	.3415	.3729	.2837

Correlation Matrices for All 18 Vehicles

Correlation Coefficients between pairs of Vehicle Parameters:

N= 18 DF= 16 R@ .0500= .4683 R@ .0100= .5897

VARIABLE	AIR	PMP/PLS	OXD	3WY	BOTH	#CAT	TYPE	FS	A/F	EGR	ETW	#CYL
AIR	1.0000											
PMP/PLS	.9286	1.0000										
OXD	.1890	.0236	1.0000									
3WY	-.7559	-.6614	-.2500	1.0000								
BOTH	.5345	.5345	-.3536	-.7071	1.0000							
#CAT	.2224	.2224	-.2942	-.3922	.8321	1.0000						
TYPE	-.0279	.0279	-.1474	.3686	0.	.1735	1.0000					
FS	.6786	.7679	-.2362	-.4725	.5345	.2224	.2229	1.0000				
A/F	-.0945	-.0472	-.5000	.2500	.2357	.3922	.2949	-.0945	1.0000			
EGR	.2362	.1890	.1250	-.5000	.3536	.2942	-.1843	.2362	-.2500	1.0000		
ETW	-.1013	-.0716	.4207	.2589	-.4053	-.2937	.5944	.0874	-.2034	-.1294	1.0000	
#CYL	-.1793	-.1793	.2372	.3162	-.4472	-.3721	.5595	0.	-.1581	0.	.8596	1.0000
	AIR	PMP/PLS	OXD	3WY	BOTH	#CAT	TYPE	FS	A/F	EGR	ETW	#CYL

Correlation Matrices for 16 Cars (All Vehicles Except the Ethyl & Dresser Cars)

Correlation Coefficients between pairs of Vehicle Parameters:

N= 16 DF= 14 R@ .0500= .4973 R@ .0100= .6226

VARIABLE	AIR	PMP/PLS	OXD	3WY	BOTH	#CAT	TYPE	FS	A/F	EGR	ETW	#CYL
AIR	1.0000											
PMP/PLS	.9115	1.0000										
OXD	.1816	0.	1.0000									
3WY	-.7125	-.5970	-.2548	1.0000								
BOTH	.5447	.5578	-.4286	-.7645	1.0000							
#CAT	.2894	.3266	-.4880	-.5919	.8783	1.0000						
TYPE	.2774	.3651	-.2182	.2335	-.0727	-.1491	1.0000					
FS	.8321	.9129	-.2182	-.5449	.6547	.4472	.3333	1.0000				
A/F	-.2774	-.1826	-.6547	.3892	.0727	.1491	.3333	0.	1.0000			
EGR	.3026	.2390	.1429	-.5606	.4286	.4880	-.2182	.2182	-.2182	1.0000		
ETW	.0946	.1245	.4752	.1287	-.4370	-.5045	.5159	.0787	-.2011	-.1546	1.0000	
#CYL	-.0402	-.0529	.2845	.2368	-.4109	-.4102	.6276	-.0483	-.0483	-.0316	.8676	1.0000
	AIR	PMP/PLS	OXD	3WY	BOTH	#CAT	TYPE	FS	A/F	EGR	ETW	#CYL

APPENDIX 5

Regression Analyses Modeling Cold-Start CO Emissions

The results from forward and backward selection indicate that relationships can be determined which have R-squared values that exceed 0.7. The relationships are summarized below.

Results From Backward Selection

	-----Value of the Coefficient of the Term-----						
Dependent Variable	Constant	Temp	FS	ETW	FS*TEMP	FS*TEMP^2	R-Sq.
Bag 1 CO	-134.310	0.852	109.59	0.021	-1.800	0.006	0.78
Bag 1 CO-Bag 1 CO @75°	-97.936	0.855	102.01	0.010	-1.846	0.007	0.76

Results From Forward Selection

	---Value of the Coefficient of the Term--					
Dependent Variable	Constant	Temp^2	ETW	FS*TEMP	FS*ETW	R-Sq.
Bag 1 CO	73.719	0.009	-0.041	-1.131	0.031	0.77
Bag 1 CO-Bag 1 CO @75°	93.998	0.009	-0.047	-1.153	0.029	0.76

FS is a categorical variable. If a venicle has fuel injection, FS = 0. If a vehicle is carbureted, FS = 1.0.

```
SELECT OPTIONS=STEPWISE,BACKWARD VAR=03;2,20,7,12,17,71,72,74,81,82
   MAXIM=100 LEVELS=.05,.10>

Selection of Regression of Bag 1 CO (BONE) Using All Vehicles Except
   Ethyl & Dresser Cars (16 Cars)

ANALYSIS AT STEP 0 (Initial Step) FOR 3.BONE  N= 119 OUT OF 119

SOURCE                DF    SUM OF SQRS   MEAN SQUARE    F-STAT      SIGNIF

REGRESSION            10     .13340 +6     13340.         37.606       .0000
ERROR                108     38312.         354.74
TOTAL                118     .17172 +6

MULTIPLE R= .88141  R-SQR= .77689  SE= 18.835

     VARIABLE       PARTIAL  COEFFICIENT  STD ERROR    T-STAT      SIGNIF

     CONSTANT                  -196.08      .61971 +8  -.31641 -5  1.0000
   2.TEMP             .09395    1.9510      1.9894       .98070       .3289
  20.TEMP.2          -.05871   -.10570 -1   .17294 -1   -.61117       .5424
   7.PLS              .00000    43.252      .61971 +8    .69794 -6  1.0000
  12.FS               .00000    164.36      .61971 +8    .26522 -5  1.0000
  17.ETW              .49705    .20961 -1   .35212 -2   5.9529        .0000
  71.PLS*TEMP        -.01431   -.17138      1.1523      -.14873       .8820
  72.PLS*TEMP.2       .02097    .20800 -2   .95443 -2    .21794       .8279
  74.FS*PLS          -.00000   -44.638      .61971 +8   -.72030 -6  1.0000
  81.FS*TEMP         -.31725   -2.3125      .66518     -3.4766        .0007
  82.FS*TEMP.2        .18052    .11077 -1   .58077 -2    1.9073       .0591

ANALYSIS AT STEP 5 (Final Step) FOR 3.BONE  N= 119 OUT OF 119

SOURCE                DF    SUM OF SQRS   MEAN SQUARE    F-STAT      SIGNIF

REGRESSION             5     .13309 +6     26617.         77.856       .0000
ERROR                113     38632.         341.88
TOTAL                118     .17172 +6

MULTIPLE R= .88036  R-SQR= .77503  SE= 18.490

     VARIABLE       PARTIAL  COEFFICIENT  STD ERROR    T-STAT      SIGNIF

     CONSTANT                  -134.31      18.737      -7.1682       .0000
   2.TEMP             .33372    .85150      .22627       3.7633       .0003
  12.FS               .72186    109.59      9.8839       11.088       .0000
  17.ETW              .49366    .20792 -1   .34457 -2    6.0341       .0000
  81.FS*TEMP         -.61885   -1.7998      .21491      -8.3747       .0000
  82.FS*TEMP.2        .40289    .64208 -2   .13722 -2    4.6793        0000

     REMAINING      PARTIAL   SIGNIF

  20.TEMP.2         -.07818     .4083
   7.PLS            -.03940     .6772
  71.PLS*TEMP       -.03181     .7369
  72.PLS*TEMP.2     -.03738     .6930
  74.FS*PLS         -.03940      6772

REGRESSION OF 3.BONE USING BACKWARD SELECTION

STEP    R-SQR   STD ERROR   # VAR      VARIABLE          PARTIAL   SIGNIF

   0   .77689    18.835       10                    IN
   1   .77689    18.748        9     7.PLS          OUT   .00000   1.0000
   2   .77688    18.663        8    74.FS*PLS       OUT  -.00420    .9651
   3   .77648    18.595        7    72.PLS*TEMP.2   OUT   .04247    .6566
   4   .77640    18.515        6    71.PLS*TEMP     OUT  -.01894    .8422
   5   .77503    18.490        5    20.TEMP.2       OUT  -.07818    .4083
```

```
SELECT OPTIONS=STEPWISE,FORWARD VAR=03;2,20,7,12,17,71-74,81-83,91,92,93
   MAXIM=100 LEVELS=.05,.10>

Selection of Regression of Bag 1 CO (BONE) Using All Vehicles Except
   Ethyl & Dresser Cars (16 Cars)

ANALYSIS AT STEP 1 (Initial Step) FOR 3.BONE  N= 119 OUT OF 119

SOURCE                DF   SUM OF SQRS  MEAN SQUARE   F-STAT     SIGNIF

REGRESSION             1    68342.       68342.       77.350      .0000
ERROR                117    .10337 +6    883.55
TOTAL                118    .17172 +6

MULTIPLE R= .63087  R-SQR= .39799  SE= 29.724

     VARIABLE       PARTIAL  COEFFICIENT  STD ERROR   T-STAT     SIGNIF

     CONSTANT                  84.892       6.9503     12.214      .0000
   2 TEMP           -.63087   -.87305       .99268 -1  -8.7949     .0000

     REMAINING      PARTIAL   SIGNIF

  20 TEMP.2          .23864    .0093
   7 PLS            -.15201    .1003
  12 FS              .49859    .0000
  17 ETW             .40492    .0000
  71 PLS*TEMP       -.06789    .4651
  72 PLS*TEMP.2      .06538    .4818
  73 PLS*ETW         .05522    .5526
  74 FS*PLS          .43871    .0000
  81 FS*TEMP         .29072    .0014
  82 FS*TEMP.2       .26129    .0043
  83 FS*ETW          .60202    .0000
  91 FS*PLS*TEMP     .27256    .0028
  92 FS*PLS*TEMP.2   .26594    .0036
  93 FS*PLS*ETW      .55526    .0000

ANALYSIS AT STEP 6 (Final Step) FOR 3.BONE  N= 119 OUT OF 119

SOURCE                DF   SUM OF SQRS  MEAN SQUARE   F-STAT     SIGNIF

REGRESSION             4    .13245 +6    33114.       96.147      .0000
ERROR                114    39262.       344.41
TOTAL                118    .17172 +6

MULTIPLE R= .87827  R-SQR= .77135  SE= 18.558

     VARIABLE       PARTIAL  COEFFICIENT  STD ERROR   T-STAT     SIGNIF

     CONSTANT                  73.719      13.485      5.4670      .0000
  20 TEMP.2          .45367    .85788 -2    .15783 -2  5.4353      .0000
  17 ETW            -.53754   -.41108 -1    .60398 -2 -6.8063      .0000
  81 FS*TEMP        -.69676  -1.1313        .10908    -10.371       .0000
  83 FS*ETW          .77019    .31124 -1    .24141 -2  12.893      .0000

     REMAINING      PARTIAL   SIGNIF

   2 TEMP           -.09398    .3178
   7 PLS             .00901    .9238
  12 FS             -.04090    .6643
  71 PLS*TEMP       -.02375    .8011
  72 PLS*TEMP.2     -.01029    .9131
  73 PLS*ETW         .00901    .9238
  74 FS*PLS          .00542    .9542
  82 FS*TEMP.2       .15276    .1031
  91 FS*PLS*TEMP    -.00009    .9992
  92 FS*PLS*TEMP.2   .07951    .3983
  93 FS*PLS*ETW      .00901    .9238

REGRESSION OF 3.BONE USING FORWARD SELECTION

STEP    R-SQR   STD ERROR  # VAR      VARIABLE          PARTIAL  SIGNIF

   1   .39799    29.724       1    2 TEMP          IN  -.63087   .0000
   2   .61618    23.836       2   83 FS*ETW        IN   .60202   .0000
   3   .67576    22.003       3   81 FS*TEMP       IN  -.39400   .0000
   4   .67446    21.952       2    2 TEMP         OUT  -.06331   .4977
   5   .71210    20.734       3   17 ETW          IN  -.34005   .0002
   6   .77135    18.558       4   20 TEMP.2       IN   .45367   .0000
```

```
SELECT OPTIONS=STEPWISE,BACKWARD VAR=18;2,20,7,12,17,71,72,74,81,82
   MAXIM=100 LEVELS=.05,.10>

Selection of Regression of the Amount (DIFF) by Which Bag 1 CO Exceeds
   Bag 1 CO at 75'F for 16 Veh.

ANALYSIS AT STEP 0 (Initial Step) FOR 18.DIFF  N= 119 OUT OF 119

SOURCE                DF    SUM OF SQRS  MEAN SQUARE    F-STAT      SIGNIF

REGRESSION            10    .11430 +6     11430.        35.366       .0000
ERROR                108    34905.        323.19
TOTAL                118    .14921 +6

MULTIPLE R= .87525  R-SQR= .76606  SE= 17.978

     VARIABLE       PARTIAL  COEFFICIENT  STD ERROR    T-STAT      SIGNIF

     CONSTANT                -152.92       .59151 +8  -.25853 -5  1.0000
   2.TEMP            .08594    1.7021       1.8988      .89639      .3720
  20.TEMP.2         -.04937   -.84796 -2    .16507 -1  -.51369      .6085
   7.PLS             .00000   39.773        .59151 +8   .67239 -6  1.0000
  12.FS              .00000   154.42        .59151 +8   .26107 -5  1.0000
  17.ETW             .27953    .10169 -1    .33610 -2  3.0256       .0031
  71.PLS*TEMP       -.00545   -.62300 -1    1.0998     -.56645 -1   .9549
  72.PLS*TEMP.2      .01299    .12302 -2    .91100 -2   .13504      .8928
  74.FS*PLS         -.00000   -44.047       .59151 +8  -.74466 -6  1.0000
  81.FS*TEMP        -.32684   -2.2819       .63492     -3.5939      .0005
  82.FS*TEMP.2       .18239    .10687 -1    .55434 -2   1.9278      .0565

ANALYSIS AT STEP 5 (Final Step) FOR 18.DIFF  N= 119 OUT OF 119

SOURCE                DF    SUM OF SQRS  MEAN SQUARE    F-STAT      SIGNIF

REGRESSION             5    .11404 +6     22808.        73.283       .0000
ERROR                113    35169.        311.23
TOTAL                118    .14921 +6

MULTIPLE R= .87424  R-SQR= .76430  SE= 17.642

     VARIABLE       PARTIAL  COEFFICIENT  STD ERROR    T-STAT      SIGNIF

     CONSTANT                -97.936       17.878     -5.4781      .0000
   2.TEMP            .34915    .85508       .21589      3.9608      .0001
  12.FS              .71323   102.01        9.4305      10.817       .0000
  17.ETW             .27547    .10015 -1    .32876 -2   3.0461      .0029
  81.FS*TEMP        -.64637   -1.8464        .20505     -9.0050      .0000
  82.FS*TEMP.2       .43369    .66984 -2    .13092 -2   5.1164      .0000

     REMAINING      PARTIAL   SIGNIF

  20.TEMP.2         -.07237    .4442
   7.PLS            -.03987    .6736
  71.PLS*TEMP       -.03009    .7506
  72.PLS*TEMP.2     -.03470    .7140
  74.FS*PLS         -.03987    .6736

REGRESSION OF 18.DIFF USING BACKWARD SELECTION

STEP    R-SQR  STD ERROR  # VAR      VARIABLE          PARTIAL  SIGNIF

   0   .76606   17.978      10                        IN
   1   .76606   17.895       9     7.PLS             OUT   .00000  1.0000
   2   .76606   17.814       8     71.PLS*TEMP       OUT  -.00545   .9547
   3   .76578   17.744       7     72.PLS*TEMP.2     OUT   .03467   .7167
   4   .76553   17.674       6     74.FS*PLS         OUT  -.03229   .7342
   5   .76430   17.642       5     20.TEMP.2         OUT  -.07237   .4442
```

```
SELECT OPTIONS=STEPWISE,FORWARD VAR=18;2,20,7,12,17,71-74,81-83,91,92,93
   MAXIM=100 LEVELS=.05,.10>

Selection of Regression of the Amount (DIFF) by Which Bag 1 CO Exceeds
   Bag 1 CO at 75 F for 16 Veh.

ANALYSIS AT STEP 1 (Initial Step) FOR 18.DIFF  N= 119 OUT OF 119

SOURCE                DF    SUM OF SQRS  MEAN SQUARE    F-STAT      SIGNIF

REGRESSION             1     72307.        72307.        110.01       .0000
ERROR                117     76901.        657.27
TOTAL                118     .14921 +6

MULTIPLE R= .69614  R-SQR= .48461  SE= 25.637

     VARIABLE       PARTIAL  COEFFICIENT  STD ERROR    T-STAT      SIGNIF

     CONSTANT                   73.145      5.9946       12.202       0000
   2 TEMP            - 69614  - .89801      .85618 -1   -10.489       0000

     REMAINING      PARTIAL    SIGNIF

  20 TEMP.2           27473      .0026
   7 PLS            - 10272      .2683
  12 FS               37123      .0000
  17 ETW              23127      .0117
  71 PLS*TEMP       - 00670      .9426
  72 PLS*TEMP.2       13664      .1401
  73 PLS*ETW          01750      .8508
  74 FS*PLS           33336      .0002
  81 FS*TEMP          14306      .1222
  82 FS*TEMP.2        14778      .1103
  83 FS*ETW           41252      .0000
  91 FS*PLS*TEMP      15279      .0986
  92 FS*PLS*TEMP.2    18404      .0460
  93 FS*PLS*ETW       38121      .0000

ANALYSIS AT STEP 6 (Final Step) FOR 18.DIFF  N= 119 OUT OF 119

SOURCE                DF    SUM OF SQRS  MEAN SQUARE    F-STAT      SIGNIF

REGRESSION             4     .11270 +6     28175.        87.983       .0000
ERROR                114     36507.        320.23
TOTAL                118     .14921 +6

MULTIPLE R= .86910  R-SQR= .75533  SE= 17.895

     VARIABLE       PARTIAL  COEFFICIENT  STD ERROR    T-STAT      SIGNIF

     CONSTANT                   93.998      13.003       7.2292       .0000
  20 TEMP.2            47347    .87349 -2    .15219 -2   5.7394       .0000
  17 ETW             - 60221  - .46906 -1    .58239 -2  -8.0540       .0000
  81 FS*TEMP         - 71626  -1.1526         .10518     -10.959       .0000
  83 FS*ETW            75492    .28610 -1    .23278 -2   12.290       .0000

     REMAINING      PARTIAL    SIGNIF

   2 TEMP            - 11582      .2177
   7 PLS               00387      .9672
  12 FS                01878      .8421
  71 PLS*TEMP       - 03368      .7208
  72 PLS*TEMP.2     - 01504      .8732
  73 PLS*ETW          00387      .9672
  74 FS*PLS           00519      .9561
  82 FS*TEMP.2        17170      .0665
  91 FS*PLS*TEMP    - 00480      .9594
  92 FS*PLS*TEMP.2    08610      .3602
  93 FS*PLS*ETW       00387      .9672

REGRESSION OF 18.DIFF USING FORWARD SELECTION

STEP    R-SQR   STD ERROR   # VAR      VARIABLE          PARTIAL  SIGNIF

   1    48461    25.637        1    2 TEMP          IN  - 69614    0000
   2    57231    23.455        2   83 FS*ETW        IN    41252    0000
   3    62143    22.163        3   81 FS*TEMP       IN  - 33888    0002
   4    61485    22.258        2    2 TEMP          OUT - 13071    1601
   5    68463    20.228        3   17 ETW           IN  - 42566    0000
   6    75533    17.895        4   20 TEMP.2        IN    47347    0000
```

```
SELECT OPTIONS=STEPWISE,BACKWARD VAR=19;2,20,7,12,17,71,72,74,81,82
   MAXIM=100 LEVELS=.05,.10>

Selection of Regression of Quotient (RATIO) of Bag 1 CO Divided by
   Bag 1 CO at 75°F for 16 Vehicles

ANALYSIS AT STEP 0 (Initial Step) FOR 19.RATIO  N= 119 OUT OF 119

SOURCE                DF    SUM OF SQRS   MEAN SQUARE    F-STAT      SIGNIF

REGRESSION            10     891.60        89.160        9.3464       .0000
ERROR                108     1030.3        9.5395
TOTAL                118     1921.9

MULTIPLE R= .68112  R-SQR= .46392  SE= 3.0886

     VARIABLE       PARTIAL  COEFFICIENT  STD ERROR    T-STAT      SIGNIF

     CONSTANT                 -2.8227      .10162 +8  -.27776 -6   1.0000
   2.TEMP           -.00029   -.96814 -3   .32623     -.29677 -2    .9976
  20.TEMP.2         -.00122   -.35951 -4   .28360 -2  -.12677 -1    .9899
   7.PLS             .00000    .45237 -1   .10162 +8   .44514 -8   1.0000
  12.FS              .00000   9.6308       .10162 +8   .94769 -6   1.0000
  17.ETW             .11350    .68549 -3   .57742 -3   1.1872       .2378
  71.PLS*TEMP        .01778    .34911 -1   .18896       .18476      .8538
  72.PLS*TEMP.2     -.00563   -.91602 -4   .15651 -2  -.58527 -1    .9534
  74.FS*PLS         -.00000  -2.3586       .10162 +8  -.23209 -6   1.0000
  81.FS*TEMP        -.14079   -.16120      .10908     -1.4778       .1424
  82.FS*TEMP.2       .08368   .83111 -3   .95238 -3    .87267      .3848

ANALYSIS AT STEP 7 (Final Step) FOR 19.RATIO  N= 119 OUT OF 119

SOURCE                DF    SUM OF SQRS   MEAN SQUARE    F-STAT      SIGNIF

REGRESSION             3     868.04        289.35        31.575       .0000
ERROR                115     1053.8        9.1638
TOTAL                118     1921.9

MULTIPLE R= .67206  R-SQR= .45166  SE= 3.0272

     VARIABLE       PARTIAL  COEFFICIENT  STD ERROR    T-STAT      SIGNIF

     CONSTANT                  .62845      .97537       .64432      .5207
  12.FS              .56296    6.5177       .89227      7.3046       .0000
  81.FS*TEMP        -.43346   -.13936       .27017 -1  -5.1581       .0000
  82.FS*TEMP.2       .29451    .74008 -3   .22393 -3   3.3049       .0013

     REMAINING      PARTIAL    SIGNIF

   2.TEMP             .07341     .4335
  20.TEMP.2           .07109     .4483
   7.PLS             -.02253     .8103
  17.ETW              .10982     .2406
  71.PLS*TEMP         .03515     .7080
  72.PLS*TEMP.2       .04881     .6028
  74.FS*PLS          -.02253     .8103

REGRESSION OF 19.RATIO USING BACKWARD SELECTION

STEP    R-SQR   STD ERROR  # VAR      VARIABLE          PARTIAL  SIGNIF

   0   .46392   3.0886       10                         IN
   1   .46392   3.0744        9     7.PLS              OUT   .00000  1.0000
   2   .46392   3.0604        8     2.TEMP             OUT  -.00029   .9976
   3   .46390   3.0467        7    20.TEMP.2           OUT  -.00659   .9450
   4   .46382   3.0332        6    72.PLS*TEMP.2       OUT  -.01189   .9005
   5   .45879   3.0339        5    71.PLS*TEMP         OUT   .09647   .3072
   6   .45828   3.0220        4    74.FS*PLS           OUT  -.03075   .7443
   7   .45166   3.0272        3    17.ETW              OUT   .10982   .2406
```

```
SELECT OPTIONS=STEPWISE,FORWARD VAR=19;2,20,7,12,17,71-74,81-83,91,92,93
   MAXIM=100 LEVELS=.05,.10>

Selection of Regression of Quotient (RATIO) of Bag 1 CO Divided by
   Bag 1 CO at 75°F for 16 Vehicles

ANALYSIS AT STEP 1 (Initial Step) FOR 19.RATIO  N= 119 OUT OF 119

SOURCE                DF    SUM OF SQRS  MEAN SQUARE   F-STAT     SIGNIF

REGRESSION             1     638.94       638.94       58.270      .0000
ERROR                117     1282.9       10.965
TOTAL                118     1921.9

MULTIPLE R= .57659  R-SQR= .33246  SE= 3.3114

     VARIABLE       PARTIAL  COEFFICIENT  STD ERROR   T-STAT     SIGNIF

     CONSTANT                  7.9725       .77427     10.297      .0000
   2.TEMP          -.57659  -.84416 -1    .11059 -1  -7.6335      .0000

     REMAINING      PARTIAL   SIGNIF

  20.TEMP.2          .26269    .0041
   7.PLS            -.07387    .4266
  12.FS              .19936    .0304
  17.ETW             .11698    .2071
  71.PLS*TEMP       -.00879    .9247
  72.PLS*TEMP.2      .11775    .2041
  73.PLS*ETW        -.01050    .9102
  74.FS*PLS          .16701    .0707
  81.FS*TEMP         .08684    .3498
  82.FS*TEMP.2       .13610    .1417
  83.FS*ETW          .21702    .0183
  91.FS*PLS*TEMP     .08943    .3355
  92.FS*PLS*TEMP.2   .16164    .0803
  93.FS*PLS*ETW      .19046    .0388

ANALYSIS AT STEP 4 (Final Step) FOR 19.RATIO  N= 119 OUT OF 119

SOURCE                DF    SUM OF SQRS  MEAN SQUARE   F-STAT     SIGNIF

REGRESSION             4     828.87       207.22       21.613      .0000
ERROR                114     1093.0       9.5877
TOTAL                118     1921.9

MULTIPLE R= .65672  R-SQR= .43128  SE= 3.0964

     VARIABLE       PARTIAL  COEFFICIENT  STD ERROR   T-STAT     SIGNIF

     CONSTANT                  7.5243       1.6640      4.5217      .0000
   2.TEMP          -.41340  -.22931       .47304 -1  -4.8475      .0000
  20.TEMP.2          .32536   .18132 -2    .49354 -3   3.6738      .0004
  82.FS*TEMP.2      -.21074  -.34248 -3    .14879 -3  -2.3018      .0232
  83.FS*ETW          .29133   .68738 -3    .21140 -3   3.2515      .0015

     REMAINING      PARTIAL   SIGNIF

   7.PLS            -.06731    .4748
  12.FS              .17058    .0684
  17.ETW            -.17274    .0649
  71.PLS*TEMP       -.02812    .7654
  72.PLS*TEMP.2     -.01590    .8661
  73.PLS*ETW        -.11539    .2194
  74.FS*PLS          .05007    .5951
  81.FS*TEMP         .06203    .5101
  91.FS*PLS*TEMP    -.00961    .9188
  92.FS*PLS*TEMP.2  -.01590    .8661
  93.FS*PLS*ETW     -.06731    .4748

REGRESSION OF 19.RATIO USING FORWARD SELECTION

STEP    R-SQR   STD ERROR  # VAR      VARIABLE          PARTIAL  SIGNIF

  1    .33246   3.3114       1    2.TEMP           IN  -.57659   .0000
  2    .37852   3.2088       2   20.TEMP.2         IN   .26269   .0041
  3    .40485   3.1537       3   83.FS*ETW         IN   .20583   .0260
  4    .43128   3.0964       4   82.FS*TEMP.2      IN  -.21074   .0232
```